



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014

No. 56

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 7, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### HONORING RETIRED STATE SENATORS ALLEN PAUL AND JOHNNY NUGENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of two extraordinary Indiana State legislators: Senators Allen Paul and Johnny Nugent. These two close friends have served the State of Indiana for decades.

I want to personally thank them for all of their hard work and recognize them for their many accomplishments.

First, let me tell you a little bit about Senator Allen Paul. Allen volun-

teered for the U.S. Army in 1967 and is a decorated Vietnam veteran. He was awarded the Bronze Star for saving a man's life and also earned a Combat Infantry Badge and four Air Medals.

After being honorably discharged from the Army, Allen was elected to the State senate in 1986, where he was a tireless advocate for military members and their families. He passed important legislation to help veterans receive a college degree and supported legislation to offer in-state tuition for veterans.

Senator Paul has the distinction of being the first legislator from eastern Indiana to serve in a leadership position within his caucus. During his 28-year tenure in the senate, he served as majority whip, chairman of the Insurance Committee and chair of the Financial Institutions Committee. His political savvy and institutional knowledge will certainly be missed by his colleagues in the State legislature.

Senator Paul's dear friend Senator Johnny Nugent has also decided to retire after more than 30 years in office. He too is a veteran of the U.S. Army and Army Reserve.

At the age of 26, Johnny was elected Dearborn County commissioner, the youngest commissioner ever elected in Indiana. As a State senator, Johnny Nugent held numerous leadership positions, including majority floor leader, chair of the Agricultural and Small Business Committee and ranking member of the Insurance and Financial Institutions Committee.

Senator Nugent has been a tireless defender of the Second Amendment and served two terms on the NRA's board of directors. During his tenure in the senate, he successfully sponsored Indiana's "Castle Doctrine," as well as the Nation's first lifetime concealed-carry permit.

Senator Nugent is also known for his involvement in his local community. He is a member of the Dearborn County

Chamber of Commerce and the southeastern Indiana Shrine Club. He also served on the Dearborn County Hospital board of trustees.

Both Allen Paul and Johnny Nugent serve as shining examples of what it means to be a public servant. I ask the entire Sixth Congressional District to join me in recognizing these two outstanding Hoosier legislators.

I have no doubt these great men will bring the same commitment, dedication, and enthusiasm that they have had during their service to their constituents and their communities, and apply that in the next chapter of their lives.

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on two core principles: freedom of speech and freedom of religion, both of which are contained in the First Amendment of the Constitution. No one in America is arrested for criticizing elected officials, including the President. No one in America is imprisoned for going to a mosque on a Friday, a synagogue on a Saturday, or a church on a Sunday.

The fact that we as Americans can express ourselves so freely and choose to worship whenever and wherever we want are at the heart of America's greatness. That is why I am so troubled by the recent events surrounding the high-tech entrepreneur and Mozilla co-founder, Brendan Eich, who, despite his unquestioned professional credentials, was forced to resign because of a \$1,000 personal donation he made in 2008 in support of Proposition 8, the California ballot initiative in support of traditional marriage.

Regardless of your views on marriage, any American who values the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2963

First Amendment should be deeply troubled that this man was essentially driven from his job because of his personal beliefs. I want to stress his personal beliefs, not his company's, but his own.

Nowhere have I read that Mr. Eich ever discriminated against coworkers. In fact, by all accounts, he is a fair and honorable employer. Yet, because of his private beliefs about traditional marriage, which I share, he has been demonized and his livelihood has been compromised.

As troubling as this particular incident is, the chilling effect it will have on the broader issues of free speech cannot be overstated.

I find it notable that Andrew Sullivan, a leading activist in the gay community, has come to Mr. Eich's defense. Mr. Sullivan has been widely quoted as writing:

The whole episode disgusts me, as it should anyone interested in a tolerant and diverse society. If this is the gay rights movement today, hounding our opponents with a fanaticism more like the religious right than anyone else, then count me out.

Yes, public opinion on gay marriage has shifted since 2008, when both then-Presidential candidates Barack Obama and JOHN MCCAIN supported defining marriage as a union of one man and one woman. But America has never been defined by mob rule.

Even if just 1 percent of the country supported defining marriage as between a man and a woman, which is hardly the case, that 1 percent still has a right to hold that view, particularly when it is a view based, in many cases, on one's most deeply held faith convictions.

I understand that reasonable people can disagree on issues. In fact, robust debate in the public square is itself an American hallmark. What happened last week was not debate. It was stifling of the debate. It was the silencing of dissent. It was compromising of our Nation's most cherished principles: freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

The implications are vast and deeply troubling. We should all be concerned. I know I am.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence, and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

We ask that You send Your spirit upon them, giving them the gifts of patience and diligence. With all the pressures for action that cry out each day, and with all the concern and worry that accompanies any responsibility, we pray that they might know Your peace, which surpasses all human understanding.

May Your voice speak to them in the depths of their hearts, illuminating their minds and spirits, thus enabling them to view the tasks of this day with confidence and hope. All this day, and through the week, may they do their best to find solutions to the pressing issues facing our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### OBAMACARE IS HURTING SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, when Mary West purchased insurance through the government health care Web site, she didn't expect to lose access to her doctor.

Ms. West struggles with diabetes and high blood pressure. Because of these health concerns, she has developed a relationship with the doctors she trusted at Spartanburg Regional Healthcare System.

She was devastated when she realized that her policy was not accepted by her

local hospital. Trying to obtain an alternative policy that would be taken at Spartanburg Regional has been even more difficult due to the lack of communication between the provider and the hospital.

This story, highlighted over the weekend in the Spartanburg Herald Journal, reveals the nightmares South Carolinians and millions of Americans are experiencing as a direct result of ObamaCare's failures.

This unworkable law is tragically flawed. It is not fair that the President's broken promises have created barriers when making a trip to the doctor.

ObamaCare will continue to hammer down on our families if it is not repealed and replaced with a common-sense solution that maintains the doctor-patient relationship, instead of Big Government's dictates destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### THE FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, today marks the 100th day that unemployed Americans have been cut off the Federal unemployment insurance program.

Let me give voice to how they have spent the last 100 days. A woman from Pennsylvania wrote:

It's scary, Mr. Levin, not knowing what will happen from day to day. My landlord has tried to be as patient as he could, and now, he had no choice but to serve me an eviction notice. It is scary to think that my America is this cruel.

Carol from New York:

I have been in the medical field for over 25 years and unable to find work. I can't pay my rent, electric bill, phone bill, no money for gas, no money for food. I can't even print out my resume for a job because I can't afford to buy ink for my printer.

This is the first time in my life I had to go to a food pantry. I was ashamed. Never in a million years would I imagine this is where I would be. I am not looking for a handout. I just need a little help to get back on my feet until I find a job.

Tonight, the Senate will pass a bipartisan UI extension. This House must not ignore these stories. We must act.

#### ABILITYONE PROGRAM

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the outstanding work of the AbilityOne Program and Bosma Enterprises in my district, in Indiana.

AbilityOne is an outstanding program committed to providing employment opportunities for people suffering from vision loss. Since 1915, Indiana's very own Bosma Enterprises has been a

partner of the program, with the goal of changing lives.

In fact, Bosma is Indiana's largest employer of people with vision loss, helping acclimate over 700 people last year alone and helping over 50,000 people find employment since it started.

It is about more than the numbers, though. Take Chris McKirahan. She was born with glaucoma, meaning she had the eyes of an 80-year-old at the time she was born. At the age of 43, she lost all of her vision and began orientation and mobility training at Bosma Enterprises.

Following that training, she began volunteering as a Braille and keyboarding instructor. In November of 2010, she was hired on full time as a production employee; but she continues to volunteer in her free time, teaching Braille and keyboarding in the very center she graduated from 4 years ago.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to extend my support to the AbilityOne Program and Bosma Enterprises. They are difference makers; they are changing lives.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT CHIEF OF STAFF, THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. PITTS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Thomas Tillett, District Chief of Staff, the Honorable JOSEPH R. PITTS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 26, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I, as custodian of records for Congressman Joe Pitts, have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, requesting documents in a third-party civil case.

As I have determined that there are no documents responsive to the subpoena, it is not necessary for me to determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

THOMAS TILLETT,  
District Chief of Staff,  
Congressman Joe Pitts.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 7, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following mes-

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on April 7, 2014 at 10:19 a.m.:

That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 88.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SOMALIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-103)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, with respect to Somalia is to continue in effect beyond April 12, 2014.

On January 17, 2013, the United States Government announced its recognition of the Government of Somalia. The United States had not recognized a government in Somalia for the previous 22 years. Although the U.S. recognition underscores a strong commitment to Somalia's stabilization, it does not remove the importance of U.S. sanctions, especially against persons undermining the stability of Somalia. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Somalia and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 7, 2014.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1602

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER) at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill, which is H.R. 1872, which is the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act of 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 539, I call up the bill (H.R. 1872) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Budget, printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1872

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Budget and Accounting Transparency Act of 2014".*

##### TITLE I—FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES

##### SEC. 101. CREDIT REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

##### "TITLE V—FAIR VALUE

##### "SEC. 500. SHORT TITLE.

*"This title may be cited as the 'Fair Value Accounting Act of 2014'.*

##### "SEC. 501. PURPOSES.

*"The purposes of this title are to—*

*"(1) measure more accurately the costs of Federal credit programs by accounting for them on a fair value basis;*

*"(2) place the cost of credit programs on a budgetary basis equivalent to other Federal spending;*

*"(3) encourage the delivery of benefits in the form most appropriate to the needs of beneficiaries; and*

*"(4) improve the allocation of resources among Federal programs.*

##### "SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

*"For purposes of this title:*

*"(1) The term 'direct loan' means a disbursement of funds by the Government to a non-Federal borrower under a contract that requires the repayment of such funds with or without interest. The term includes the purchase of, or participation in, a loan made by another lender and financing arrangements that defer payment for more than 90 days, including the sale of a Government asset on credit terms. The term does not include the acquisition of a federally guaranteed loan in satisfaction of default claims or the price support loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation.*

*"(2) The term 'direct loan obligation' means a binding agreement by a Federal agency to make a direct loan when specified conditions are fulfilled by the borrower.*

*"(3) The term 'loan guarantee' means any guarantee, insurance, or other pledge with respect to the payment of all or a part of the principal or interest on any debt obligation of a*

non-Federal borrower to a non-Federal lender, but does not include the insurance of deposits, shares, or other withdrawable accounts in financial institutions.

“(4) The term ‘loan guarantee commitment’ means a binding agreement by a Federal agency to make a loan guarantee when specified conditions are fulfilled by the borrower, the lender, or any other party to the guarantee agreement.

“(5)(A) The term ‘cost’ means the sum of the Treasury discounting component and the risk component of a direct loan or loan guarantee, or a modification thereof.

“(B) The Treasury discounting component shall be the estimated long-term cost to the Government of a direct loan or loan guarantee, or modification thereof, calculated on a net present value basis, excluding administrative costs and any incidental effects on governmental receipts or outlays.

“(C) The risk component shall be an amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the estimated long-term cost to the Government of a direct loan or loan guarantee, or modification thereof, estimated on a fair value basis, applying the guidelines set forth by the Financial Accounting Standards Board in Financial Accounting Standards #157, or a successor thereto, excluding administrative costs and any incidental effects on governmental receipts or outlays; and

“(ii) the Treasury discounting component of such direct loan or loan guarantee, or modification thereof.

“(D) The Treasury discounting component of a direct loan shall be the net present value, at the time when the direct loan is disbursed, of the following estimated cash flows:

“(i) Loan disbursements.

“(ii) Repayments of principal.

“(iii) Essential preservation expenses, payments of interest and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries, including the effects of changes in loan terms resulting from the exercise by the borrower of an option included in the loan contract.

“(E) The Treasury discounting component of a loan guarantee shall be the net present value, at the time when the guaranteed loan is disbursed, of the following estimated cash flows:

“(i) Payments by the Government to cover defaults and delinquencies, interest subsidies, essential preservation expenses, or other payments.

“(ii) Payments to the Government including origination and other fees, penalties, and recoveries, including the effects of changes in loan terms resulting from the exercise by the guaranteed lender of an option included in the loan guarantee contract, or by the borrower of an option included in the guaranteed loan contract.

“(F) The cost of a modification is the sum of—

“(i) the difference between the current estimate of the Treasury discounting component of the remaining cash flows under the terms of a direct loan or loan guarantee and the current estimate of the Treasury discounting component of the remaining cash flows under the terms of the contract, as modified; and

“(ii) the difference between the current estimate of the risk component of the remaining cash flows under the terms of a direct loan or loan guarantee and the current estimate of the risk component of the remaining cash flows under the terms of the contract as modified.

“(G) In estimating Treasury discounting components, the discount rate shall be the average interest rate on marketable Treasury securities of similar duration to the cash flows of the direct loan or loan guarantee for which the estimate is being made.

“(H) When funds are obligated for a direct loan or loan guarantee, the estimated cost shall be based on the current assumptions, adjusted to incorporate the terms of the loan contract, for the fiscal year in which the funds are obligated.

“(6) The term ‘program account’ means the budget account into which an appropriation to cover the cost of a direct loan or loan guarantee program is made and from which such cost is disbursed to the financing account.

“(7) The term ‘financing account’ means the nonbudget account or accounts associated with each program account which holds balances, receives the cost payment from the program account, and also includes all other cash flows to and from the Government resulting from direct loan obligations or loan guarantee commitments made on or after October 1, 1991.

“(8) The term ‘liquidating account’ means the budget account that includes all cash flows to and from the Government resulting from direct loan obligations or loan guarantee commitments made prior to October 1, 1991. These accounts shall be shown in the budget on a cash basis.

“(9) The term ‘modification’ means any Government action that alters the estimated cost of an outstanding direct loan (or direct loan obligation) or an outstanding loan guarantee (or loan guarantee commitment) from the current estimate of cash flows. This includes the sale of loan assets, with or without recourse, and the purchase of guaranteed loans (or direct loan obligations) or loan guarantees (or loan guarantee commitments) such as a change in collection procedures.

“(10) The term ‘current’ has the same meaning as in section 250(c)(9) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

“(11) The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(12) The term ‘administrative costs’ means costs related to program management activities, but does not include essential preservation expenses.

“(13) The term ‘essential preservation expenses’ means servicing and other costs that are essential to preserve the value of loan assets or collateral.

#### **“SEC. 503. OMB AND CBO ANALYSIS, COORDINATION, AND REVIEW.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For the executive branch, the Director shall be responsible for coordinating the estimates required by this title. The Director shall consult with the agencies that administer direct loan or loan guarantee programs.

“(b) DELEGATION.—The Director may delegate to agencies authority to make estimates of costs. The delegation of authority shall be based upon written guidelines, regulations, or criteria consistent with the definitions in this title.

“(c) COORDINATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—In developing estimation guidelines, regulations, or criteria to be used by Federal agencies, the Director shall consult with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

“(d) IMPROVING COST ESTIMATES.—The Director and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall coordinate the development of more accurate data on historical performance and prospective risk of direct loan and loan guarantee programs. They shall annually review the performance of outstanding direct loans and loan guarantees to improve estimates of costs. The Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office shall have access to all agency data that may facilitate the development and improvement of estimates of costs.

“(e) HISTORICAL CREDIT PROGRAMS COSTS.—The Director shall review, to the extent possible, historical data and develop the best possible estimates of adjustments that would convert aggregate historical budget data to credit reform accounting.

#### **“SEC. 504. BUDGETARY TREATMENT.**

“(a) PRESIDENT’S BUDGET.—Beginning with fiscal year 2017, the President’s budget shall reflect the costs of direct loan and loan guarantee programs. The budget shall also include the planned level of new direct loan obligations or loan guarantee commitments associated with each appropriations request. For each fiscal

year within the five-fiscal year period beginning with fiscal year 2017, such budget shall include, on an agency-by-agency basis, subsidy estimates and costs of direct loan and loan guarantee programs with and without the risk component.

“(b) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, new direct loan obligations may be incurred and new loan guarantee commitments may be made for fiscal year 2017 and thereafter only to the extent that—

“(1) new budget authority to cover their costs is provided in advance in an appropriation Act;

“(2) a limitation on the use of funds otherwise available for the cost of a direct loan or loan guarantee program has been provided in advance in an appropriation Act; or

“(3) authority is otherwise provided in appropriations Acts.

“(c) EXEMPTION FOR DIRECT SPENDING PROGRAMS.—Subsections (b) and (e) shall not apply to—

“(1) any direct loan or loan guarantee program that constitutes an entitlement (such as the guaranteed student loan program or the veteran’s home loan guaranty program);

“(2) the credit programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation existing on the date of enactment of this title; or

“(3) any direct loan (or direct loan obligation) or loan guarantee (or loan guarantee commitment) made by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

#### **“(d) BUDGET ACCOUNTING.—**

“(1) The authority to incur new direct loan obligations, make new loan guarantee commitments, or modify outstanding direct loans (or direct loan obligations) or loan guarantees (or loan guarantee commitments) shall constitute new budget authority in an amount equal to the cost of the direct loan or loan guarantee in the fiscal year in which definite authority becomes available or indefinite authority is used. Such budget authority shall constitute an obligation of the program account to pay to the financing account.

“(2) The outlays resulting from new budget authority for the cost of direct loans or loan guarantees described in paragraph (1) shall be paid from the program account into the financing account and recorded in the fiscal year in which the direct loan or the guaranteed loan is disbursed or its costs altered.

“(3) All collections and payments of the financing accounts shall be a means of financing.

“(e) MODIFICATIONS.—An outstanding direct loan (or direct loan obligation) or loan guarantee (or loan guarantee commitment) shall not be modified in a manner that increases its costs unless budget authority for the additional cost has been provided in advance in an appropriations Act.

“(f) REESTIMATES.—When the estimated cost for a group of direct loans or loan guarantees for a given program made in a single fiscal year is re-estimated in a subsequent year, the difference between the reestimated cost and the previous cost estimate shall be displayed as a distinct and separately identified subaccount in the program account as a change in program costs and a change in net interest. There is hereby provided permanent indefinite authority for these re-estimates.

“(g) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—All funding for an agency’s administrative costs associated with a direct loan or loan guarantee program shall be displayed as distinct and separately identified subaccounts within the same budget account as the program’s cost.

#### **“SEC. 505. AUTHORIZATIONS.**

“(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCING ACCOUNTS.—In order to implement the accounting required by this title, the President is authorized to establish such non-budgetary accounts as may be appropriate.

“(b) TREASURY TRANSACTIONS WITH THE FINANCING ACCOUNTS.—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Treasury shall borrow from, receive from, lend to, or pay to the financing accounts such amounts as may be appropriate. The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe forms and denominations, maturities, and terms and conditions for the transactions described in the preceding sentence, except that the rate of interest charged by the Secretary on lending to financing accounts (including amounts treated as lending to financing accounts by the Federal Financing Bank (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the ‘Bank’) pursuant to section 405(b)) and the rate of interest paid to financing accounts on uninvested balances in financing accounts shall be the same as the rate determined pursuant to section 502(5)(G).

“(2) *LOANS.*—For guaranteed loans financed by the Bank and treated as direct loans by a Federal agency pursuant to section 406(b)(1), any fee or interest surcharge (the amount by which the interest rate charged exceeds the rate determined pursuant to section 502(5)(G) that the Bank charges to a private borrower pursuant to section 6(c) of the Federal Financing Bank Act of 1973 shall be considered a cash flow to the Government for the purposes of determining the cost of the direct loan pursuant to section 502(5). All such amounts shall be credited to the appropriate financing account.

“(3) *REIMBURSEMENT.*—The Bank is authorized to require reimbursement from a Federal agency to cover the administrative expenses of the Bank that are attributable to the direct loans financed for that agency. All such payments by an agency shall be considered administrative expenses subject to section 504(g). This subsection shall apply to transactions related to direct loan obligations or loan guarantee commitments made on or after October 1, 1991.

“(4) *AUTHORITY.*—The authorities provided in this subsection shall not be construed to supersede or override the authority of the head of a Federal agency to administer and operate a direct loan or loan guarantee program.

“(5) *TITLE 31.*—All of the transactions provided in the subsection shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code.

“(6) *TREATMENT OF CASH BALANCES.*—Cash balances of the financing accounts in excess of current requirements shall be maintained in a form of uninvested funds and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay interest on these funds. The Secretary of the Treasury shall charge (or pay if the amount is negative) financing accounts an amount equal to the risk component for a direct loan or loan guarantee, or modification thereof. Such amount received by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be a means of financing and shall not be considered a cash flow of the Government for the purposes of section 502(5).

“(c) *AUTHORIZATION FOR LIQUIDATING ACCOUNTS.*—(1) Amounts in liquidating accounts shall be available only for payments resulting from direct loan obligations or loan guarantee commitments made prior to October 1, 1991, for—

“(A) interest payments and principal repayments to the Treasury or the Federal Financing Bank for amounts borrowed;

“(B) disbursements of loans;

“(C) default and other guarantee claim payments;

“(D) interest supplement payments;

“(E) payments for the costs of foreclosing, managing, and selling collateral that are capitalized or routinely deducted from the proceeds of sales;

“(F) payments to financing accounts when required for modifications;

“(G) administrative costs and essential preservation expenses, if—

“(i) amounts credited to the liquidating account would have been available for administrative costs and essential preservation expenses under a provision of law in effect prior to October 1, 1991; and

“(ii) no direct loan obligation or loan guarantee commitment has been made, or any modification of a direct loan or loan guarantee has been made, since September 30, 1991; or

“(H) such other payments as are necessary for the liquidation of such direct loan obligations and loan guarantee commitments.

“(2) Amounts credited to liquidating accounts in any year shall be available only for payments required in that year. Any unobligated balances in liquidating accounts at the end of a fiscal year shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts as soon as practicable after the end of the fiscal year.

“(3) If funds in liquidating accounts are insufficient to satisfy obligations and commitments of such accounts, there is hereby provided permanent, indefinite authority to make any payments required to be made on such obligations and commitments.

“(d) *REINSURANCE.*—Nothing in this title shall be construed as authorizing or requiring the purchase of insurance or reinsurance on a direct loan or loan guarantee from private insurers. If any such reinsurance for a direct loan or loan guarantee is authorized, the cost of such insurance and any recoveries to the Government shall be included in the calculation of the cost.

“(e) *ELIGIBILITY AND ASSISTANCE.*—Nothing in this title shall be construed to change the authority or the responsibility of a Federal agency to determine the terms and conditions of eligibility for, or the amount of assistance provided by a direct loan or a loan guarantee.

#### “SEC. 506. TREATMENT OF DEPOSIT INSURANCE AND AGENCIES AND OTHER INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

“This title shall not apply to the credit or insurance activities of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, Resolution Trust Corporation, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, National Flood Insurance, National Insurance Development Fund, Crop Insurance, or Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### “SEC. 507. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

“(a) *EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.*—This title shall supersede, modify, or repeal any provision of law enacted prior to the date of enactment of this title to the extent such provision is inconsistent with this title. Nothing in this title shall be construed to establish a credit limitation on any Federal loan or loan guarantee program.

“(b) *CREDITING OF COLLECTIONS.*—Collections resulting from direct loans obligated or loan guarantees committed prior to October 1, 1991, shall be credited to the liquidating accounts of Federal agencies. Amounts so credited shall be available, to the same extent that they were available prior to the date of enactment of this title, to liquidate obligations arising from such direct loans obligated or loan guarantees committed prior to October 1, 1991, including repayment of any obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Financing Bank. The unobligated balances of such accounts that are in excess of current needs shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Such transfers shall be made from time to time but, at least once each year.”

“(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by striking the items relating to title V and inserting the following:

#### “TITLE V—FAIR VALUE

“Sec. 500. Short title.

“Sec. 501. Purposes.

“Sec. 502. Definitions.

“Sec. 503. OMB and CBO analysis, coordination, and review.

“Sec. 504. Budgetary treatment.

“Sec. 505. Authorizations.

“Sec. 506. Treatment of deposit insurance and agencies and other insurance programs.

“Sec. 507. Effect on other laws.”

#### SEC. 102. BUDGETARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A change in discretionary spending solely as a result of the amendment to title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 made by the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act of 2014 shall be treated as a change of concept under this paragraph.”

(b) *REPORT.*—Before adjusting the discretionary caps pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a), the Office of Management and Budget shall report to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the amount of that adjustment, the methodology used in determining the size of that adjustment, and a program-by-program itemization of the components of that adjustment.

(c) *SCHEDULE.*—The Office of Management and Budget shall not make an adjustment pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) sooner than 60 days after providing the report required in subsection (b).

#### SEC. 103. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 101 shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 2017.

#### TITLE II—BUDGETARY TREATMENT

#### SEC. 201. CBO AND OMB STUDIES RESPECTING BUDGETING FOR COSTS OF FEDERAL INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Office of Management and Budget shall each prepare a study and make recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate as to the feasibility of applying fair value concepts to budgeting for the costs of Federal insurance programs.

#### SEC. 202. ON-BUDGET STATUS OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements, including the administrative expenses, of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

(1) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

(2) the congressional budget; and

(3) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 203. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 202 shall not apply with respect to an enterprise (as such term is defined in section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502)) after the date that all of the following have occurred:

(1) The conservatorship for such enterprise under section 1367 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 4617) has been terminated.

(2) The Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency has certified in writing that such enterprise has repaid to the Federal Government the maximum amount consistent with minimizing total cost to the Federal Government of the financial assistance provided to the enterprise by the Federal Government pursuant to the amendments made by section 1117 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–289; 122 Stat. 2683) or otherwise.

(3) The charter for the enterprise has been revoked, annulled, or terminated and the authorizing statute (as such term is defined in such section 1303) with respect to the enterprise has been repealed.

### TITLE III—BUDGET REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

#### SEC. 301. CBO AND OMB REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING RECEIPTS AND COLLECTIONS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare a study of the history of offsetting collections against expenditures and the amount of receipts collected annually, the historical application of the budgetary terms “revenue”, “offsetting collections”, and “offsetting receipts”, and review the application of those terms and make recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate of whether such usage should be continued or modified. The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall review the history and recommendations prepared by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and shall submit comments and recommendations to such Committees.

#### SEC. 302. AGENCY BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS.

Section 1108 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsections:

“(h)(1) Whenever any agency prepares and submits written budget justification materials for any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate, such agency shall post such budget justification on the same day of such submission on the ‘open’ page of the public website of the agency, and the Office of Management and Budget shall post such budget justification in a centralized location on its website, in the format developed under paragraph (2). Each agency shall include with its written budget justification the process and methodology the agency is using to comply with the Fair Value Accounting Act of 2014.

“(2) The Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, shall develop and notify each agency of the format in which to post a budget justification under paragraph (1). Such format shall be designed to ensure that posted budget justifications for all agencies—

“(A) are searchable, sortable, and downloadable by the public;

“(B) are consistent with generally accepted standards and practices for machine-discoverability;

“(C) are organized uniformly, in a logical manner that makes clear the contents of a budget justification and relationships between data elements within the budget justification and among similar documents; and

“(D) use uniform identifiers, including for agencies, bureaus, programs, and projects.

“(i)(1) Not later than the day that the Office of Management and Budget issues guidelines, regulations, or criteria to agencies on how to calculate the risk component under the Fair Value Accounting Act of 2014, it shall submit a written report to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate containing all such guidelines, regulations, or criteria.

“(2) For fiscal year 2017 and each of the next four fiscal years thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit an annual report to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate reviewing and evaluating the progress of agencies in the implementation of the Fair Value Accounting Act of 2014.

“(3) Such guidelines, regulations, or criteria shall be deemed to be a rule for purposes of section 553 of title 5 and shall be issued after notice and opportunity for public comment in accordance with the procedures under such section.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee, Chairman PAUL RYAN, and the Budget Committee staff as well for their hard work on H.R. 1872, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act.

As many have talked about before, our budget process in this country is broken. Simply put, we need to make the budget process more transparent. So the bill before the House today, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, is, as we like to say, a common-sense attempt to introduce more sunshine and common sense into our budget process. So what would this legislation do?

Most importantly, the bill will require that the Federal Government apply something called fair value accounting. Now, that is the same credit accounting standards as the private sector uses when making or guaranteeing loans. So fair value accounting provides a more robust or more complete picture of the cost to the taxpayer of government loan programs or government lending programs. So fair value accounting accomplishes this how? By accounting for an additional market-risk premium.

Also, the bill recognizes the budgetary impact of government-sponsored enterprises of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. So this bill would then bring these wards of the taxpayer from out of the shadows and onto the budget.

So why exactly do we need this specific piece of legislation here today? Well, without getting into the weeds too much, the simplest explanation is that there is no such thing in this country or in the world as a free lunch when it comes to a government program. The costs are always borne by someone, and in this case, it is borne by the American people.

The facts indicate that not only is government costly, but also government costs more than we all initially expected. So the burden of government rarely comes in under budget. Nowhere does this ring truer than the Federal Housing Administration program, also called FHA, and their mortgage insurance. See, it defies common sense FHA, according to administration's Federal accounting rules, that they actually make money, they say, for the government.

How do they do so? Well, it is only through the alchemy of government accounting can you transform a mortgage portfolio of figurative lead into gold and still remain true to the law.

So this free money comes courtesy of what? It comes courtesy of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. This is the Federal accounting program and the standard that we operate today.

Under FCRA's cooked accounting rules, the cost of Federal mortgage insurance is determined on the basis of a subsidy cost, including the risk that

the borrowers default on a mortgage; and by using the Treasury rate, it does not account for market risk or overall systemic risk.

So, what does that mean? Unlike fair value accounting, which appropriately incorporates a premium for market risk, the current law fails to reflect the true cost to the American taxpayer of these FHA mortgage-backed insurance.

Let me give you an example. In the 2011 report, the nonpartisan CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, compared the cost of the current system of FHA of a single-family mortgage insurance on both the current law and what we have here, which is fair value basis.

What did CBO find? Well, CBO estimated that, under the current accounting, FHA would actually raise—raise—\$4.4 billion for the government in 2012. Sounds pretty good. But if you actually dug into the numbers and use fair value basis—which, as I said before, is what the private sector would be forced to do—with an appropriate accounting of market risk—and of course, market risk is there—then what did CBO find? CBO then estimated that FHA would not gain \$4.4 billion, but that FHA would actually lose \$3.5 billion over the exact same period.

Why is this? Because CBO believes that fair value provides a fuller picture of a program's budgetary impact. So it now employs fair value basis accounting as a standard procedure for Federal loan programs and Federal loan guarantee programs such as FHA.

However, where is the problem? The problem is the Obama administration has strongly resisted the move to fair value accounting, and instead, they cling to the current program instead.

Let me give you another example. In 2010, President Obama effectively nationalized the Federal student lending program. The President then immediately spent the savings, if you will—remember, I talked about some of these before—on his signature health care law.

What is the problem? The problem is that there is a growing gap now between how much money was borrowed and backed by the U.S. taxpayer—that means you and I—and how much money is actually being repaid by the graduates.

Let me give you some numbers. Based on the Department of Education data, there is a \$99 billion gap between what has been borrowed and what has been paid back since only 2010. Remember, the President said these loans would actually make money for the Federal Government. Instead, the actual numbers are coming in that it is costing a \$99 billion gap.

So, the bill before us today, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act, fixes these shortcomings by requiring that market risk to be explicitly included in estimates of Federal credit programs. What will that do? That will bring Federal budget practice in line with what has long been standard practice in the private sector.

Specifically, it requires the executive branch and Congress to use fair value accounting in calculating the cost of Federal credit programs that consider not only the borrowing cost of the Federal Government, but also the cost of the market risk of the Federal Government in incurring or issuing any of these loans or loan guarantee programs.

And so, with mounting debt and a lackluster job growth, it is time to force the government to play by the same economic rules as every single American family and business has to. It is not fair to keep putting the American taxpayer on the hook.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Let me say at the outset that we welcome any proposals to improve the budget process, but it is a mistake to suggest that simply tinkering with the budget process will somehow solve our problems.

The bigger issue in the Congress has been an unwillingness of many people to compromise, and at the end of the day, in order to make budgets work, you have to have give-and-take. So, for example, the reason we saw our government shut down last October had nothing to do with the budget process. It had to do with the fact that our Republican colleagues said they were going to shut down the government as a means to try and shut down the Affordable Care Act, to shut down ObamaCare.

It was clear that that was not going to work. We are not about to strip millions of Americans from the new insurance protections they have. Despite that, our colleagues pursued that strategy, and we saw 16 days of unnecessary and unproductive government shut-down. That was not a problem of process; it was a problem of politics.

Now, with respect to this bill, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey that, if your bill were limited to bringing Fannie and Freddie on budget, we would join you. We would welcome you in that. But, as you know, this bill does much more than that. In fact, it fundamentally changes the way we account for credit programs, Federal credit programs, including things like the student loan programs.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned the impact on the FHA. A couple years ago—I think it was 3 years ago—on the Budget Committee we actually had a hearing on this subject. This bill was then on the floor in 2012. At that time, many of us said that, before we consider the other changes that this bill proposes, at least we should have a hearing in the Budget Committee to determine what the impact will be on student loan programs, Small Business Administration programs, veterans loan programs, at least we should have that information. Yet 3 years have gone by. We are now back with the same bill on the floor

with no hearings to try and judge what impact it would have on student loan programs.

I want to mention the student loan programs in particular.

The gentleman said that the President had “nationalized” the student loan program. Let me just translate what that means. It had been that the big banks were essentially a conduit for all of our student loan programs. They were taking very little risk, but they were pocketing big profits just as a middle man, a middle man without risks but taking the profits. So Democrats proposed that we go to a direct loan program to try and make sure the taxpayer dollar actually did what we hoped it would do, which was provide more students with loans to help more of them afford college. So, yes, we got rid of the middle man and we used the savings to try to increase—and in fact, did increase—the amount of funds available so more students could afford to go to college.

Now, this bill comes along, and it would actually change the way we account for student loans, to artificially make those student loans look more expensive on the budget than they would otherwise be from a budget perspective.

Now, maybe this isn't surprising. After all, just last week in the House Budget Committee, we debated the House Republican budget. In fact, that Republican budget is going to be here and debated on the floor of the House tomorrow. We will start debate on that budget. That budget significantly cuts the student loan program. So one of the things it does is it charges students interest on their loans while they are still in college.

□ 1615

That is about \$41 billion of additional interest costs they put onto students. At the same time, in their budget, they protect special interest tax breaks for hedge fund owners, big oil companies and the like. So that is what their budget does.

Now, this piece of legislation would address that from a different direction. It actually would artificially increase the cost on the budget books of student loans going forward.

Let me just read from a letter from a Dr. Reischauer, who was the former head of the Congressional Budget Office. He writes:

The accounting convention used since enactment of the Credit Reform Act of 1990 already reflects the risks that borrowers will default on their loans or loan guarantees. Under Credit Reform, costs are already based on the expected actual cash flow from the direct loans and guarantees. This bill proposes to place an additional budgetary cost on top of the actual cash flows.

Then he goes on to point out that that may be something that Members want to consider during debate, but to actually put that artificial inflation in the budget actually is potentially misleading to people who are looking at the budget.

So, like so many bills around here that are misnamed, this one, named the Budget Transparency and Accountability Act, actually reduces budget transparency by putting in the budget a cost for student loans that is actually artificially increased.

I would suggest to my colleagues that we reject this particular proposal.

Again, if the gentleman had brought to the floor a bill that simply put Freddie and Fannie on budget that would be fine. But this bill actually is a vehicle to inflate the actual costs of things like student loans, at the same time where we have a Republican budget coming to the floor that actually cuts those student loans.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and if I can catch him before he leaves, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I appreciate all of your comments. I won't touch on all of them, but I will touch on one or two.

In a sign of bipartisanship, I would like to extend to you, not knowing where this bill may end up in the future of things here in the House and the Senate, but extend to you an invitation to cosponsor with me what you said twice during your remarks that you seemed to be on the same page as I am and as I have been for a long time with regard to the GSEs and have fair value accounting applied to them and on budget.

I would extend that invitation to you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. GARRETT, what I said was I support the part of your amendment that puts them on budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Right.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So, to the extent that that is your question on the budget, I am happy to join with you on that. I wish you would join with us now in reconsidering your proposals to change the student loan calculations, but we may be asking too much at this point.

Mr. GARRETT. So, as I say, my staff will talk to your staff on that, and thank you for your other comments.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a letter dated January 30 from the American Action Forum, which is an organization run by former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin—and I won't go into detail—but he basically wrote to express his complete support of H.R. 3581, the Budget and Accounting Transparency Act of 2014, for the

very reasons that we have set forth here already.

Mr. Speaker, I am not seeing any other speakers at this time. I do see there are several other speakers on the other side, so I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN ACTION FORUM,  
January 30, 2012.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I am writing to express my support for H.R. 3581, "The Budget and Accounting Transparency Act of 2011," in particular those provisions that would incorporate fair value accounting (FVA) into the federal budget process. As you are well aware, a core objective in federal budgeting is to accurately display the scale and timing of the expenditure of taxpayer resources. Since sovereign tax and borrowing powers should always be used judiciously, there is a premium on doing so as accurately as possible.

In some cases this is straightforward. Consider, for example, a discretionary appropriation. The scale of the overall commitment is clear and in some cases it is straightforward to budget the timing of the ultimate outlays as well. Federal credit programs, however, present particular difficulties. The timing of budgetary cash flows differs dramatically between direct loans and federal loan guarantees—even in cases when the ultimate economic impact is identical. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) took an important step forward by equalizing the timing of their budgetary treatment. Direct loans and loan guarantees are both recorded in the budget during the year in which the commitment is incurred, regardless of the duration and timing of the federal assistance.

This was an important step in the right direction. However, estimating the scale of required taxpayer resources remains problematic. In particular, the ability of loan recipients to make timely and complete repayments will be influenced by future individual, household, and economy-wide economic conditions. In the same way, the obligation of the federal government to undertake guarantee payments will be driven by similar forces.

While such future individual and economic conditions are uncertain, reliable techniques exist to estimate the likely size of the taxpayer obligation. Unfortunately, FCRA needlessly restricts the analyses to credit risk—the probability of failure to fully repay—while ignoring the fact that the timing of those failures matters enormously. As the past few years have starkly reminded every American, the need to tax, borrow and otherwise deprive the private sector of another dollar has far greater implications during the depths of economic distress than during periods of robust economic growth. Adoption of FVA would rectify this oversight.

I recognize that significant reform to budget procedures should not be undertaken lightly. However, my views are informed by the fact that during my tenure as director, the Congressional Budget Office undertook a number of studies of the implications of accounting fully for economic risks in the budgetary treatment of financial commitments like credit programs. In example after example (pension guarantees; deposit insurance; flood insurance; student loans; and assistance for Chrysler and America West Airlines), it becomes clear that an incomplete assessment of risks leads to misleading budget presentations and may engender poor policy decisions. FVA would be a significant step toward improving this informational deficit.

My views are echoed by a wide array of budget experts. In March 2010, CBO issued a new report recommending the use of FVA for federal student loan programs on the grounds that budget rules do "not include the costs to taxpayers that stem from certain risks involved in lending." In addition, the Pew-Peterson Commission on Budget Reform proposed "fair-value accounting" for credit programs and the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform advocated for reform of budget concepts that would more accurately reflect costs.

In addition to these research views, there is a track record of success. FVA has already been used successfully for the budgetary treatment of the Temporary Asset Relief Program of 2008 (TARP) and the federal assistance to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Last but not least, H.R. 3581 would also fix another shortcoming of FCRA; namely that the administrative costs associated with federal operations are not included in the budget cost and must be provided for elsewhere. H.R. 3581 would require that administrative costs (called "essential preservation services") to be accounted for up-front, thereby balancing the playing field.

In sum, I believe that the Congress should adopt fair value accounting and, in particular, pass H.R. 3581 in a timely fashion. I would be happy to discuss any aspect of this issue in greater detail.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. This is an illusion, another one.

The NCAA Men's Basketball National Championship game is tonight. I know that many of my colleagues are looking forward to watching some high-level competition from these two great squads. However, at some point, you can be assured, you will see one team's coach yelling at the referees. Guaranteed. They will be screaming in their faces, convinced that they are calling too many fouls and that they are being biased against their team. You can be assured that the coach yelling at the refs the most will be the one whose team is losing.

This is basically the same thing that is happening here on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, on this bill, and all the other so-called budget process. You can't get away from process. You don't want to talk about results. You are always talking about process, process, and process, trying to work the refs because you are losing this argument.

The ref in this case is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. You referred to that many, many times, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The bill before us today, offered by my colleague from New Jersey, would require the Congressional Budget Office to score Federal loan guarantee programs in a way that makes them appear more expensive than they actually are. That is what you are all about.

I have served on this Budget Committee for the last 4 years. We can't do our job right if we don't have accurate

estimates of what Federal programs really cost.

This bill will absolutely make our job harder by making us work with inaccurate data. In fact, all in all, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill, your bill, would have increased the estimated cost of Federal credit programs in 2014, would have increased them by \$50 million, all by waving your magic wand.

Now, this isn't really about finding the best technical way to measure the costs of each program. That is what you say. It is working the refs in a way that would make even Coach K proud.

It is nothing but a dishonest attempt to make worthy government programs appear more costly, so that those who are ideologically opposed to government and government spending can more easily undermine those very programs. That is what this is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like the Federal loan guarantee programs that help first-time homebuyers, that help less fortunate Americans pay for their education. They are willing to cook the books in order to make a better case for their elimination.

Mr. Speaker, we could do better than this. We can argue about these programs on their merits instead of resorting to budgeting sleight-of-hand, process.

I am strongly opposed to the bill. We could be voting to raise the minimum wage and give a raise to 27.8 million Americans to \$10.10 per hour. That is what we should be debating on this floor.

We could finally consider the immigration reform legislation that the Senate passed nearly a year ago. We should be debating the UI—unemployment insurance—rates to restore unemployment benefits to more than 2 million Americans, including 125,000 in our own State of New Jersey.

But, instead, we are here today considering a bill that does nothing except enable the majority's fringe ideology, pave the way for even more cuts to the most vulnerable in the future.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just two couple of points. Process is important. I guess you could be opposed to process—the gentleman from New Jersey referenced the NCAA. If there were no rules and all the players could just go out and do anything they wanted to, I guess we could say we could rack up a lot of points and scores and do very well.

But there is a reason and there is a method to the game, and that is why you do have rules. And that is actually why you do have the refs. Yeah, the coaches on both sides will complain, but the refs, at the end of the day, are the ones that say, hey, these are what the rules are, and let's play within the confines of them.

Now the second point I was going to make is, I understand this issue is pretty difficult and pretty complicated. The bill is not that long. But the gentleman from New Jersey has it completely backwards when he says, look, Mr. GARRETT, you want to go by the CBO, don't you? You want to apply this to the CBO, and that is what your bill is going to do.

No, that is not what I said. I do agree with the CBO. The CBO already does this. It is the CBO that is calling for this. It was the past chairman, the past director of the CBO who says what I just entered into the RECORD—that we should be doing this. This is already done that way, I inform my colleague from New Jersey.

What we are saying is, if he and I agree that the CBO is, as he just said, this nonpartisan entity which has the right way of handling it, they are handling it the right way.

We are now simply saying, administration, you should be doing what the gentleman from New Jersey and I both say should be done here, what the CBO is saying should be done here, and apply it to OMB and how the administration does it.

So the gentleman has it completely reversed as to what the bill actually says.

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you very much to my colleague from New Jersey.

First of all, no one on this side of the aisle ever suggested that we need no rules.

See, what you are trying to do is put everyone at extremes, and that is where we are many times because you are the majority and we are the minority. And I respect that.

But don't say we don't want the rules. We fought for rules.

Mr. GARRETT. Reclaiming my time, what I was just pointing out is you are saying that both sides' coaches were going to be yelling at the refs and they wanted their side, win or lose.

If you want to use your analogy, in a game there has to be rules, and we are saying that the rules that should apply are the rules that—you indicated the CBO is a nonpartisan entity, that they are doing it the right way, and we are saying, exactly.

The CBO is nonpartisan. They are calling for this type of application of the rules. And if we agree on that point, and if you dig into the bill and realize that we are saying it is not to make sure that CBO does it, but that the administration does it.

So reread the bill. You will understand what we are trying to do. And I think, at the end of the day, you and I may actually agree.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't as complicated as one would pretend it to be. First of all, the CBO says, if this was the law of the land, in other words, if this bill would have been passed by both the House and the Senate when it first came up, it would have cost us \$50 billion more in the 2014 budget.

Now, I find that hard to believe that you would accept that, when you practically, the gentleman that I am speaking to right now, through the Chair, has voted "no" on everything under the Sun. So I find that difficult to believe.

There need to be rules, particularly in all financial matters. Those rules have a purpose.

I am telling you, this is a process question and this does not, in any manner, shape, or form enhance the passage of a budget that we can live with, we Americans.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

One of the interesting elements of this debate is, and I think it is pretty clear that we have not a total disagreement of opinion on the two sides, we both want the same objective, which is a fair and honest accounting of what programs cost the taxpayer or how they may benefit the taxpayer.

We do know that it is pretty generally agreed that by moving toward the fair accounting method, the fair value method, that we would be creating a higher cost, or at least the budget would indicate a higher cost for many of the loan programs that we have been talking about. But we don't know exactly what the ultimate impact would be and which method would be more accurate.

□ 1630

But we don't know exactly what the ultimate impact would be and which method would be more accurate.

OMB does not support this proposal. OMB says it has a hard time figuring out how it could assess market-based value, so we don't have total disagreement here.

We are in search of the same objective; but there is another element of this that I think we have to consider, in that, when we compare loan programs in the private sector to loan programs from the government, we are not always comparing apples and apples. We are comparing two very different motivations.

In the private sector, when a financial institution makes a loan, its entire objective is to create return for its in-

vestors and stockholders. The loan is essentially isolated in purpose. You advance funds, you expect a return, and that is the ultimate objective.

When the government creates a loan program, it is not just to make money for the government. In fact, that is often not even considered. What we are trying to do in many cases is to create an additional outcome—an ancillary outcome that is the primary objective of the program.

For instance, with student loans, we are trying to create more college graduates throughout this country. Understanding that the more college graduates we have, from a strictly financial standpoint, the Treasury will benefit because people will be earning higher incomes and paying higher tax rates.

When we are talking about housing programs, we are looking at things like the VA—the VA housing program. We are trying to find a way to help veterans, many of whom come back from deployments disoriented, dislocated, and without any way to find housing. We are trying to create programs that will help repay our obligations to our veterans.

There are many other areas. We have an advanced vehicle manufacturing loan program. I know about this program very well because it was part of that loan program that resulted in a \$600 million investment in the Louisville assembly plant in my district in Kentucky and now has added more than 3,000 new employees in my district.

So the objective there was not necessarily—as a matter of fact, it wasn't at all to make money for the government. It was to help stimulate the production of energy-efficient appliances and to promote advanced technologies throughout our vehicle sector.

So, again, just to say because there is an associated risk that is recognized in the private sector by financial institutions does not imply that we should necessarily say that that same risk is equally important in the Federal budgeting process because, again, we have essentially ulterior motives in virtually every loan program that we have.

So we understand, again, as the ranking member Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland said: We do want transparency; we want to make sure that the American people know exactly what the programs cost.

Probably, more importantly, internally, we need to know what these programs cost because we have to make policy decisions as to whether they are benefiting the country as a whole, benefiting the taxpayers, and benefiting the Treasury.

The question is, without the kind of analysis that the ranking member suggested, what we actually determined through hearings and discussions, what the cost of the student loan program would be, how many students we potentially are cutting out of the student loan program, what we might be doing

in the energy sector by imposing higher costs through the budgeting process and, therefore, a lower participation rate through the actual program, whether we are actually damaging the economy and the budget in different ways, not just on the direct costs versus benefits of the actual loan program; so these are some of the considerations.

This is why we say this is a bill that is not ready for prime time, and we think that we could be spending a better time in this body on more important measures to help the American people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the chairman of the full committee, I want to go back to the gentleman from New Jersey who made the point as to which side of this issue is OMB and CBO on, and it is a process issue.

But it is important that, during an appearance before the House Budget Committee, where we considered this legislation, the director of the—and I will stress this point again—the nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, stated, “We believe that the fair value method of accounting”—which is what is in this bill—“for Federal credit transaction programs provides a more comprehensive measure of a program’s true cost.”

This is exactly why we bring this bill to the floor. I know the gentleman indicated that a partisan OMB takes a different view, but the nonpartisan CBO takes the view of this legislation, that we should make sure that there is complete transparency.

Then all the points that the gentleman makes, as far as making the decision as to how many students we should be able to have in these programs, how large is the housing program, and so on and so forth, then we can more accurately make those final determinations once we have the actual numbers accurately before us, and that is all this legislation really does.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who was able to get a budget out of the Budget Committee in record time the other night, the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for yielding, and I also want to thank him for his hard work on this issue and for bringing this to our attention.

Look, it is really simple, Mr. Speaker. When Washington makes or guarantees a loan, it is putting taxpayers at risk. Our budget rules don’t account for all of that risk.

We understate the cost of Federal credit programs by about \$50 billion a year. That is what the current accounting rules do. Current accounting rules make it look like the government

is making all this money from all these loans when, in reality, we are consistently overstating their profitability.

Let me give you one example. Our current rules led to the projections that the FHA—those loans made between 1992 and 2012 would save us \$45 billion. It sounded like a great deal, a \$45 billion boon to the Federal Government.

In reality, those loans cost us \$15 billion of hard-working taxpayer dollars. That is a swing of \$60 billion. It is not about imposing costs. This bill is about recognizing the actual costs of what this government does. That is really what this is all about.

CBO has reviewed this time and again. The gentleman from New Jersey just mentioned this, and they have very much concluded, like the private sector, that budgeting Federal credit programs should use fair value accounting as the most accurate method for these programs.

Washington needs to be up front with taxpayers about the true cost of its decisions because the taxpayers themselves are the ones who are on the hook, but that is what the Garrett bill would do.

We can’t also forget that the Office of Management and Budget—which is a more political office under the service of the President—they are ignoring the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. In fact, OMB shows them as saving money when they are huge liabilities.

Since 2008, Fannie and Freddie have been wards of the State. They are wholly-owned subsidiaries of the Federal Government, and in 2013, the GSEs accounted for 60 percent of first lien mortgage originations. Taxpayers are exposed to over \$5 trillion of outstanding liabilities. OMB keeps it off budget.

Despite the fact that, if they ever go under, if anything happens again, like it did recently, guess who gets stuck with the tab—the taxpayers. We cannot look at our budget through rose-colored glasses. We have to be as clear-eyed as possible. We need transparency. We need real accounting. We owe it to our taxpayers.

So this bill would require the government to use fair value accounting. It would require OMB to be more honest about Fannie and Freddie’s true costs, and it would build on the best practices in the private sector, so that we, in Congress, can make better-informed decisions about the hard-working taxpayers and what we are committing for them on their behalf.

That is all this is. It doesn’t impose a cost on anybody. It simply recognizes the actual costs that are occurring.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate Chairman RYAN’s comments and agree with many of them.

I think one of the points that is important to consider here though is, while he mentions one case involving FHA, there are a number of loan pro-

grams throughout the government which don’t necessarily fall into that same category; and many of them are very, very critical to our Nation.

If you talk about water supply loans, water system loans, there are many loan programs that affect rural America. In addition to the student loans, we have, again, the Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loan Program.

There are many across the board, and what this legislation would do would essentially treat them all as exactly the same, and we know that that is not necessarily necessary.

Under the TARP program—TARP was actually accounted for in the budget using the fair value standard that is proposed in this legislation, so we actually have a history of treating some loan programs differently than others.

What we would say is: Why don’t we take the time to have hearings on this proposal to actually consider the impact of an across-the-board standard on a variety of different kinds of loan programs? This is why we keep saying this is a bill that is not ready for prime time.

There may be a considerable amount of merit in applying this accounting standard to some of the loan programs in the Federal portfolio, but that doesn’t mean it is appropriate or helpful in assessing the impact on every loan program.

Furthermore, what we do know about virtually every analysis is that using the market-based risk analysis that Mr. GARRETT’s bill proposes would, under our budgeting rules, do two things.

One, it would add to the cost of virtually every loan program. There certainly is no instance in which his analysis would say a loan program would cost any less, and what that would also do is create a misleading picture of how much that loan program actually ends up costing the taxpayers on a cash basis.

Just because there is an intangible risk factor attached to a loan program in the budget does not mean that that will ultimately be realized, and, in fact, we may never understand if it is realized by the taxpayers.

So for all of these reasons, again, we would oppose the legislation and not because we think it is a horrible idea. We just think it is an idea that has not been vetted nearly sufficiently enough and could have a serious detrimental impact on many very, very important loan programs that benefit the American people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just one point to that. I have sat through that committee now for a number of years, and since this is an issue that I have been somewhat following for that period of time, I knew that your statement saying that we haven’t had the time and haven’t spent

the time on hearings and what have you just did not ring true.

So I dug through it, and the fact of the matter is that we have actually had two hearings and two related markups on this legislation, and I think that gives us the information we need now to go forward.

Secondly, to the point that you make that the various programs are unique in their nature, absolutely, and that is why this legislation allows fair value accounting to be applied individually and evaluate each program accordingly.

We do all that in this legislation. It comes about through the multiple hearings and markups that we have had, and I think now is the time to go forward and give the American public the transparency that they are asking for.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, but not in a totally accurate way. We have had a hearing about budget processes in which this was discussed. We have not had a hearing dedicated solely to this legislation in which we could actually flesh out the impact on these various loan programs that I mentioned.

So in conclusion, I think, to kind of summarize where we are, this proposal may be a perfectly appropriate proposal. We wish that we could have more time and more analysis to determine whether we do more damage than good.

We both seek to have the most accurate budgeting process and the most accurate process for assessing the value of important government loan programs. That is a shared goal of both Republicans and Democrats.

We think that this bill is not effectively and sufficiently fleshed out to make that kind of determination at this point. We think there are far more important things that this body ought to be dealing with, including raising the minimum wage, extending unemployment benefits, working on developing infrastructure for this country, as we all know is critically needed, all of those things that would help stimulate the economy and create jobs.

□ 1645

For all of these reasons that I have mentioned and my ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, mentioned, we oppose this legislation and urge a vote "no."

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to set the record straight, actually, we did have hearings on this, and we did have markup hearings on this back in June of 2011. We dug into it at that period of time. The legislation, essentially the same, just in a different cycle, is, in essence, what we have be-

fore us today, so we have had that opportunity.

But I will say this. If we see this legislation continue on the floor today and if we see this bill actually pass today, I extend to the gentleman and the members of the committee—or anyone on the other side of the aisle—that my door is open to try to make changes to it that you see appropriate, to make it have the flexibility that you think is not in the bill, which I think is in this bill, and so on and so forth. So I stand ready to continue to work with you on it. But I think that after the hearings we have had and the importance of this legislation, now is the time to move forward.

One last point on this, and I think the chairman of the committee made the point, but let me just reiterate this. At the end of the day, it does not add any additional costs to the American taxpayer. What this bill does is just make transparent the cost that is already there. I am trying to come up with a simple analogy, but fair value accounting is not necessarily one of the simplest things you can find an analogy for, but I guess it might be like this:

You would not go to the store and just go through with your credit card swiping it along, buying the things that you need or think that you need not knowing what they actually cost as you leave the store, just putting them on your bill, knowing that at the end of the day, at the end of the month, you may get a statement. Knowing that you are going to have to pay for that bill, you wouldn't go to the store and do that any more than you should right now with the American public, put them, by using the taxpayers' credit card for all these programs, worthwhile as they may, necessary as they may be, you shouldn't just be swiping that credit card not knowing exactly what the bottom line is, not knowing what the actual cost to the American taxpayer is.

That is all this bill does is just give us that information. And with that information in hand, then we can come together, Republican and Democrat alike, on those areas that we all agree on are necessary for this country and necessary that we expend funds on, with that information in hand, and do it in a more prudent, efficient, and effective manner than we have been in the past where we have done without the information.

With that, then, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 539, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1872 is postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AFFIRMATION AND NAVAL VESSEL TRANSFER ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3470) to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3470

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Taiwan Relations Act Affirmation and Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2014".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

#### TITLE I—AFFIRMATION OF IMPORTANCE OF TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AND TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO TAIWAN

Sec. 101. Statement of policy relating to Taiwan Relations Act.

Sec. 102. Transfer of naval vessels to Taiwan.

#### TITLE II—TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN OTHER FOREIGN RECIPIENTS

Sec. 201. Findings.

Sec. 202. Transfer of naval vessels to certain other foreign recipients.

#### TITLE III—ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 301. Increase in congressional notification thresholds.

Sec. 302. Licensing of certain commerce-controlled items.

Sec. 303. Amendments relating to removal of major defense equipment from United States Munitions List.

Sec. 304. Amendment to definition of "security assistance" under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Sec. 305. Amendments to definitions of "defense article" and "defense service" under the Arms Export Control Act.

Sec. 306. Technical amendments.

#### TITLE IV—APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Sec. 401. Application of certain provisions of Export Administration Act of 1979.

# **TITLE I—AFFIRMATION OF IMPORTANCE OF TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AND TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO TAIWAN**

## **SEC. 101. STATEMENT OF POLICY RELATING TO TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Taiwan Relations Act has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific since its enactment in 1979, and it is in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States.

(2) The Taiwan Relations Act affirmed that the United States' decision to establish a diplomatic relationship with the People's Republic of China was based on the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means.

(3) The Taiwan Relations Act also states that "it is the policy of the United States to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character and to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan".

(4) The Taiwan Relations Act also states that "it is the policy of the United States to preserve and promote extensive, close, and friendly commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people on Taiwan, as well as the people on the China mainland and all other peoples of the Western Pacific area".

(5) The relationship between the United States and Taiwan has been strengthened with—

(A) Taiwan's evolution into a free society and a full-fledged, multi-party democracy;

(B) the development of Taiwan's robust market economy;

(C) Taiwan's collaboration with the United States to combat terrorism, as demonstrated in part by its participation in the Container Security Initiative; and

(D) the role Taiwan has played in addressing transnational and global challenges, including its active engagement in humanitarian relief measures, public health endeavors, environmental protection initiatives, and financial market stabilization efforts.

(6) The United States is the third largest trading partner and the largest investor in Taiwan, while Taiwan is the twelfth largest trading partner of the United States and the eighth largest United States agricultural market.

(7) Taiwan's democracy has deepened with the second peaceful transfer of power from one political party to another after the presidential election in March 2008.

(8) The United States and Taiwan are united in our shared values in free elections, personal liberty, and free enterprise.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress—

(1) reaffirms its unwavering commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act as the cornerstone of relations between the United States and Taiwan;

(2) reaffirms its support for Taiwan's democratic institutions;

(3) reaffirms that peace in the Taiwan Strait should be maintained to the benefit of the Asia-Pacific region;

(4) supports the United States commitment to Taiwan's security in accord with the Taiwan Relations Act, including Taiwan's procurement of sophisticated weapons of a defensive character, such as F-16 C/Ds aircraft and diesel electric submarines;

(5) reaffirms its commitment to deepen United States-Taiwan trade and investment relations as well as support for Taiwan's inclusion in bilateral and regional trade agreements at the appropriate time and under the

right conditions in which outstanding issues affecting United States exports are being addressed; and

(6) supports the strong and deepening relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

## **SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO TAIWAN.**

(a) TRANSFER BY SALE.—The President is authorized to transfer the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS TAYLOR (FFG-50), USS GARY (FFG-51), USS CARR (FFG-52), and USS ELROD (FFG-55) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office of the United States (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3309(a))) on a sale basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761).

(b) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)).

(c) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the recipient to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that recipient, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section.

## **TITLE II—TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN OTHER FOREIGN RECIPIENTS**

### **SEC. 201. FINDINGS.**

(a) RELATING TO MEXICO.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The partnership between the United States and Mexico helps the economic and national security of both countries, including in the area of energy.

(2) The United States and Mexico share a common goal of reducing the flow of narcotics and the influence of transnational gangs in the Hemisphere.

(3) The partnership between the United States and Mexico helps the economic competitiveness and national security of both countries.

(4) The economies of the United States and Mexico are increasingly interdependent, with bilateral foreign direct investment increasing more than six-fold over the past two decades.

(5) In 2012 alone, bilateral trade in goods and services between the United States and Mexico exceeded \$500,000,000,000.

(6) The transfer of naval vessels to Mexico authorized under section 202 supports the modernization efforts of the Mexican Navy.

(7) Such naval vessels are suitable to support Mexico's offshore maritime surveillance, counter trafficking, interdiction, and oil platform security.

(8) The transfer of such naval vessels will contribute to United States interests in promoting increased maritime awareness to support security and protection of the people of the United States and the people of Mexico.

(b) RELATING TO THAILAND.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Thailand was the first treaty ally of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region and remains a steadfast friend of the United States.

(2) In December 2003, the United States designated Thailand as a major non-NATO ally, which improved the security of both countries, particularly by facilitating joint counterterrorism efforts.

(3) For more than 30 years, Thailand has been the host country of Cobra Gold, the United States Pacific Command's annual multinational military training exercise, which is designed to ensure regional peace and promote regional security cooperation.

(4) The Royal Thai Navy has commanded Combined Task Force 151 (CTF 151) of the Combined Maritime Forces, a multi-national naval partnership consisting of 30 nations operating in and around the Gulf of Aden and off the eastern coast of Somalia.

(5) With the assistance of the Royal Thai Navy's Counter Piracy Task Group, CTF 151 is helping to expressly disrupt and suppress piracy, protect all vessels in the region and secure their free navigation.

(6) The Royal Thai Navy is also participating in the multilateral Malacca Straits patrols with other regional partners to promote maritime safety and security.

(7) The transfer of naval vessels to Thailand authorized under section 202 will support enhanced interoperability between the Royal Thai Navy and United States Navy forces.

(8) The transfer of such naval vessels underscores the United States commitment to United States-Thai relations and to peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

## **SEC. 202. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN OTHER FOREIGN RECIPIENTS.**

(a) TRANSFERS BY GRANT.—The President is authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), as follows:

(1) MEXICO.—To the Government of Mexico, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS CURTS (FFG-38) and USS MCCLUSKY (FFG-41).

(2) THAILAND.—To the Government of Thailand, the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS RENTZ (FFG-46) and USS VANDEGRIFT (FFG-48).

(b) ALTERNATIVE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the authority provided in subsection (a) to transfer specific vessels to specific countries, the President is authorized, subject to the same conditions that would apply for such country under this section, to transfer any vessel named in this section to any country named in this section such that the total number of vessels transferred to such country does not exceed the total number of vessels authorized for transfer to such country by this section.

(c) GRANTS NOT COUNTED IN ANNUAL TOTAL OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis pursuant to authority provided by subsection (a) or (b) shall not be counted against the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred in any fiscal year under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(d) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)).

(e) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the recipient to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that recipient, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

### TITLE III—ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

#### SEC. 301. INCREASE IN CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION THRESHOLDS.

##### (a) FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”;

(II) by striking “\$200,000,000” and inserting “\$300,000,000”; and

(III) by striking “\$14,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”; and

(ii) in the matter following subparagraph (P)—

(I) by inserting “of any defense articles or defense services under this Act for \$200,000,000 or more, any design and construction services for \$300,000,000 or more, or any major defense equipment for \$75,000,000 or more,” after “The letter of offer shall not be issued, with respect to a proposed sale”; and

(II) by inserting “of any defense articles or services under this Act for \$100,000,000 or more, any design and construction services for \$200,000,000 or more, or any major defense equipment for \$50,000,000 or more,” after “or with respect to a proposed sale”; and

(B) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”.

(b) COMMERCIAL SALES.—Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “\$14,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”.

#### SEC. 302. LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A license or other approval from the Department of State granted in accordance with this section may also authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations if such items are to be used in or with defense articles controlled on the United States Munitions List.

“(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements shall apply with respect to a license or other approval to authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations under paragraph (1):

“(A) Separate approval from the Department of Commerce shall not be required for such items if such items are approved for export under a Department of State license or other approval.

“(B) Such items subject to the Export Administration Regulations that are exported pursuant to a Department of State license or other approval would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce with respect to any subsequent transactions.

“(C) The inclusion of the term ‘subject to the EAR’ or any similar term on a Depart-

ment of State license or approval shall not affect the jurisdiction with respect to such items.

“(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘Export Administration Regulations’ means—

“(A) the Export Administration Regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

“(B) any successor regulations.”.

#### SEC. 303. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall take such actions as may be necessary to require that, at the time of export or reexport of any major defense equipment listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, the major defense equipment will not be subsequently modified so as to transform such major defense equipment into a defense article.

“(B) The President may authorize the transformation of any major defense equipment described in subparagraph (A) into a defense article if the President—

“(i) determines that such transformation is appropriate and in the national interests of the United States; and

“(ii) provides notice of such transformation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate consistent with the notification requirements of section 36(b)(5)(A) of this Act.

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘defense article’ means an item designated by the President pursuant to subsection (a)(1).”.

(b) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT REMOVED FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The President shall ensure that any major defense equipment that is listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, shall continue to be subject to the notification and reporting requirements of the following provisions of law:

“(A) Section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)).

“(B) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415).

“(C) Section 3(d)(3)(A) of this Act.

“(D) Section 25 of this Act.

“(E) Section 36(b), (c), and (d) of this Act.”.

#### SEC. 304. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF “SECURITY ASSISTANCE” UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) any license in effect with respect to the export to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country of—

“(i) defense articles or defense services under section 38 of the Armed Export Control Act; or

“(ii) items listed under the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supple-

ment No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations;”.

#### SEC. 305. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF “DEFENSE ARTICLE” AND “DEFENSE SERVICE” UNDER THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3), by striking “includes” and inserting “means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “includes” and inserting “means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States.”.

#### SEC. 306. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 3(a), 3(d)(1), 3(d)(3)(A), 3(e), 5(c), 6, 21(g), 36(a), 36(b)(1), 36(b)(5)(C), 36(c)(1), 36(f), 38(f)(1), 40(f)(1), 40(g)(2)(B), 101(b), and 102(a)(2), by striking “the Speaker of the House of Representatives and” each place it appears and inserting “the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and”;

(2) in section 21(i)(1) by inserting after “the Speaker of the House of Representatives” the following “, the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services of the House of Representatives.”;

(3) in sections 25(e), 38(f)(2), 38(j)(3), and 38(j)(4)(B), by striking “International Relations” each place it appears and inserting “Foreign Affairs”;

(4) in sections 27(f) and 62(a), by inserting after “the Speaker of the House of Representatives,” each place it appears the following: “the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”; and

(5) in section 73(e)(2), by striking “the Committee on National Security and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives”.

(b) OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in section 38—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by redesignating the second subparagraph (B) (as added by section 1255(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100-204; 101 Stat. 1431)) as subparagraph (C);

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(I) in clause (xi), by striking “; or” and inserting “, or”; and

(II) in clause (xii)—

(aa) by striking “section” and inserting “sections”; and

(bb) by striking “(18 U.S.C. 175b)” and inserting “(18 U.S.C. 175c)”; and

(iii) in subsection (j)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “in” after “to”; and

(B) in section 47(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “sec. 21(a),” and inserting “section 21(a),”.

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “Wherever applicable, a description” and inserting “Wherever applicable, such report shall include a description”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking “credits” and inserting “credits”).

#### TITLE IV—APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

##### SEC. 401. APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

(a) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 12(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2411(c)) has been in effect from August 20, 2001, and continues in effect on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and notwithstanding section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419). Section 12(c)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 is a statute covered by section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Subsection (a) terminates at the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to put any extraneous material on this measure into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3470. This legislation that I authored reaffirms the United States' steadfast support for Taiwan and provides the legal authority to sell naval vessels to Taiwan.

I very much appreciate the bipartisan support that we have received from Mr. ENGEL and other members of the committee across the aisle. This legislation passed unanimously out of our committee, and the bill makes several changes also to improve U.S. security assistance to friends and allies.

On April 10, 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted to govern America's relationship with the Republic of China-Taiwan. For 35 years, the act has helped maintain peace and security across the Taiwan Strait and the Asia-Pacific region.

During this time, Taiwan has undergone a monumental transformation from grinding poverty and from dictatorship to, today, a vibrant multiparty democracy. Taiwan's economy has evolved, too, to where it is today, out 10th top trading partner. This week, we recognize this 35-year transformation. Few other pieces of foreign policy legislation have been as consequential as the Taiwan Relations Act.

America's support for Taiwan has allowed this island nation to realize its full potential. It is now more impor-

tant than ever that we reaffirm our strong commitment to Taiwan and to the Taiwan Relations Act. And as chairman, I led two bipartisan delegations to Taipei, to Kaohsiung, and to Tainan to examine Taiwan's economy and to look at its defense capabilities. Today's legislation is the product of the committee's bipartisan effort to prioritize the U.S.-Taiwan relationship. By incorporating two pieces of legislation, both which passed the committee unanimously, the House of Representatives is now in a position to fulfill both the spirit and the letter of the Taiwan Relations Act.

This legislation allows the President to transfer for sale four Perry-class guided missile frigates to Taiwan, which are greatly needed to augment Taiwan's defense capabilities. I have seen firsthand the World War II-era submarines and the 50-year-old fighter jets that form the core of Taiwan's military. Congress has made it clear to the administration that it wants more defense sales to Taiwan. These four ships would bolster Taiwan's defense to ensure that peace in the Taiwan Strait continues to benefit the entire region.

In addition to supporting Taiwan, this legislation also authorizes the transfer of excess decommissioned naval vessels to Thailand and Mexico. These transfers help support the priorities of the U.S. Navy while strengthening the capability of allies and other close partners to meet our shared maritime security objectives.

The bill also makes long overdue improvements to the timeliness of U.S. arms sales to friends and allies while maintaining appropriate congressional oversight. It also makes technical amendments to update certain notification and reporting requirements under the Arms Export Control Act. Finally, the bill also clarifies that certain business confidentiality protections of the Export Administration Act continue to protect information related to export licensing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 4, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 3470, “Taiwan Relations Act Affirmation and Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2014,” Title I of which was favorably reported out of your Committee on March 25, 2014 as H. Res. 494.

As you know, H. Res. 494, which has been incorporated into Section 101 of H.R. 3470, has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I appreciate that, in response to the concerns raised by the Committee on Ways and Means concerning aspects of Title I within our Committee's jurisdiction, you have agreed to modify H.R. 3470 prior to its consideration in the House. As a result, in order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 3470. Further, the Committee will not oppose the bill's consideration on the suspension calendar, based on

our understanding that you will work with us as the legislative process moves forward to ensure that the Committee's concerns continue to be addressed. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3470, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman.

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 4, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 494, “Affirming the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act,” and forgoing a request for a sequential referral of the suspension text for H.R. 3470, “Naval Vessel Transfer and Arms Export Control Amendments Act,” in which the text of H. Res. 494 has been inserted as a new section 101. The suspension text contains agreed revisions, made at your request, to content that is within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I agree that your forgoing further action on these measures does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on these measures or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3470. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Ways and Means as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
Chairman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague, Mr. ROYCE, the distinguished chairman of our committee, once again for his bipartisan collegiality in the workings of our committee, especially on this important piece of legislation.

I want to also rise in strong support of the Taiwan Relations Act Affirmation and Naval Vessel Transfer Act.

I am proud to serve, Mr. Speaker, as the cochair of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, which has worked to ensure the Taiwan Relations Act remains the linchpin in U.S.-Taiwan relations. I am also proud of the fact, I would say to my friend, the chairman of our committee, that, since 1988, I have actually been to Taiwan 23 times and have seen extraordinary change over those three decades.

Since the signing of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979, the U.S. and Taiwan have forged a closer partnership to improve cultural and economic relations between our nations. Our partnership has been instrumental in maintaining

peace and security across the Taiwan Strait and throughout East Asia.

While it is important to mark this historic anniversary, we also should take this opportunity to affirm our—that is to say the American—commitment. As a reflection of that, today's bill authorizes the President to transfer up to four surplus U.S. naval vessels to Taiwan. Taiwan has been a valued partner in combating global terrorism and delivering humanitarian relief when needed.

China's recent declaration of an Air Defense Identification Zone and subsequent provocation toward other ships in the region has raised concerns about the possibility of escalation and provocation. That makes the security posture of friends like Taiwan even more precarious and more important and underscores the need for us to continue this defense partnership.

The bill also, as the chairman indicated, authorizes the transfer of surplus naval vessels, two each to Mexico and Thailand, both critical defense partners of this Nation. These transfers will enhance the ability of those countries to collaborate with the U.S. Navy on joint or support operations. The bill also provides an overdue modernization of the congressional review process for the licensing of U.S. defense exports. Under the new criteria, congressional review will focus on major defense exports.

The bill also will help advance the President's Export Control Reform initiative, which has long been a priority for the high-tech community which I am proud to represent in northern Virginia. I have been working with the House Foreign Affairs Committee for years to reform Federal export controls, which have stifled innovation in the American commercial defense industry and put U.S. exports at a disadvantage.

Today's bill updates the process for congressional review of exports to reflect regulatory changes now being implemented by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense.

As we celebrate the 35th anniversary of the adoption of the Taiwan Relations Act, I look forward to working with other friends of Taiwan to reaffirm America's unwavering commitment to this partnership, including trade and investment activities that will benefit both of our nations moving forward.

Over the past 60 years, the United States-Taiwan relationship has undergone dramatic changes, but Taiwan's development into a robust, lively democracy underpins the strong U.S.-Taiwan friendship we enjoy today. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join the chairman and me in supporting this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Chairman ROYCE for his

steadfast leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee on this legislation that we have before us today.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3470 strengthens the bilateral relationship between the United States and the Republic of China on Taiwan in two very important ways. First, it reaffirms Congress' commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act that for 35 years has served as the foundation of our relationship with the Republic of China on Taiwan. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it authorizes the transfer of additional Perry-class guided missile frigates to Taiwan. And I should point out that I have seen firsthand in Taiwan the threat that the People's Republic of China constantly presents to Taiwan. They are there, right across a very short distance body of water, ready to strike at any time, so reaffirming our military commitment to Taiwan is critical.

As we have seen the Chinese Government continue to escalate tensions in the region, Mr. Speaker, making certain that we enhance this security cooperation is important. As Chairman ROYCE pointed out, Taiwan is a superior trading partner with the United States. They are in the top 10 trading partners, and I point out that the trade with Taiwan represents about 500,000 jobs here in the United States.

I would like to thank the chairman for his work to further the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, and certainly look forward to working with him to determine what else we can and should be doing to support an unwavering ally in an increasingly important part of the world.

My view of successful foreign policy is that your friends trust you and your enemies fear you, and this legislation today is a good step in the direction of our enemies fearing us and our friends trusting us.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. Just as important as arms sales to Taiwan, the U.S. must support efforts to maintain and expand Taiwan's diplomatic presence. I am pleased to report to the House that legislation signed into law last year, another bipartisan product of this committee, helped Taiwan participate in the International Civil Aviation Organization for the first time since 1976.

Taiwan's participation in regional trade agreements could greatly benefit American consumers and exporters as well.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should be proud of the role that the Taiwan Relations Act has had in helping Taiwan become what it is today. Taiwan is a beacon of hope and democracy in a part of the world that still yearns for the basic freedoms that Americans and Taiwanese enjoy on a daily basis. As

we commemorate the 35th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, let us speak with one voice and offer our strong support of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3470, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to affirm the importance of the Taiwan Relations Act, to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT HERITAGE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 404) to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 404

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act".

#### SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF LEGAL AUTHORITY OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT.

(a) LEGAL AUTHORITY OF LOOKOUT.—Section 4(b) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-339; 98 Stat. 300; 16 U.S.C. 1131 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", and except that with respect to the lands described in section 3(5), the designation of such lands as a wilderness area shall not preclude the operation and maintenance of Green Mountain Lookout."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984.

#### SEC. 3. PRESERVATION OF GREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT LOCATION.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may not move Green Mountain Lookout from its current location on Green Mountain in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest unless the Secretary determines that moving Green Mountain Lookout is necessary to preserve the Lookout or to ensure the safety of individuals on or around Green Mountain. If the Secretary makes such a determination, the Secretary shall move the Green Mountain Lookout to a location outside of the lands described in section 3(5) of the Washington State Wilderness Act of 1984 and designated as a wilderness area in section 4(b) of such Act.

#### SEC. 4. ALASKA NATIVE VETERAN ALLOTMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICATION.—The term "application" means the Alaska Native Veteran Allotment application numbered AA-084021-B.

(2) *FEDERAL LAND*.—The term “Federal land” means the 80 acres of Federal land that is—

(A) described in the application; and

(B) depicted as Lot 2 in U.S. Survey No. 13957, Alaska, that was officially filed on October 9, 2009.

(3) *SECRETARY*.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) *ISSUANCE OF PATENT*.—Notwithstanding section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g) and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

(1) approve the application; and

(2) issue a patent for the Federal land to the person that submitted the application.

(c) *TERMS AND CONDITIONS*.—

(1) *IN GENERAL*.—The patent issued under subsection (b) shall—

(A) only be for the surface rights to the Federal land; and

(B) be subject to the terms and conditions of any certificate issued under section 41 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629g), including terms and conditions providing that—

(i) the patent is subject to valid existing rights, including any right of the United States to income derived, directly or indirectly, from a lease, license, permit, right-of-way, or easement on the Federal land; and

(ii) the United States shall reserve an interest in deposits of oil, gas, and coal on the Federal land, including the right to explore, mine, and remove the minerals on portions of the Federal land that the Secretary determines to be prospectively valuable for development.

(2) *ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS*.—The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions for the issuance of the patent under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 404 would preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness area of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest in my home State of Washington.

The Green Mountain Lookout was constructed in 1933 on the summit of Green Mountain for the purpose of fire detection. It was also used to look for enemy aircraft during World War II. While the lookout is no longer used for fire detection, it has, however, become a favorite destination for hikers.

Several years ago, after the lookout was damaged in a snowstorm, the Forest Service disassembled and removed the lookout by helicopter with the in-

tent of replacing the foundation and reassembling the lookout. In 2009, the lookout was reassembled, again using helicopter.

But in 2010, Mr. Speaker, an environmental group from out of State, from the State of Montana, filed and won a lawsuit claiming that the repairs violated both the Wilderness Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. As a result, a Federal judge in Seattle ordered the Forest Service to remove the historic lookout. Elimination of this popular hiking destination by this order would have begun this summer. This bill puts a stop to that nonsense and it protects the lookout.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this is not an isolated incident. Too often, lawsuits from extreme groups seek to close off public access to public lands, and too often bureaucracies are happy to comply with eliminating existing recreation from public lands. At times they even take the lead in pushing such restrictions. Credit, however, is due to the Forest Service for using common sense in this case. In other cases, such as the subsistence cabin of the Alaska Native veteran addressed also in this bill, or the halting of stocking fish in the North Cascades, which is the subject of another bill, common sense hasn't always prevailed, so it falls to Congress to fix the problem.

The House has already acted once on this piece of legislation regarding the Green Mountain Lookout, in February, by protecting this lookout. By voting on this Senate bill today, the House will send the measure to the President to be signed and to become law.

The Senate approved the measure by unanimous consent last week at the request of our Senator from Washington, Senator PATTY MURRAY. This action was prompted by a visit from Senator MURRAY to the Washington State communities affected by the tragic mudslide that claimed the lives of over two-dozen citizens. The Senator called me a week ago last Saturday morning. When she asked what she and her congressional colleagues could do to help, the mayor of Darrington, one of the communities that is affected, asked for enactment of this bill to save the lookout. It is a small action that cannot undo the tragedy, but it will help protect a recreation and economic asset in this corner of Washington State.

It goes without saying to all affected by the mudslide that our hearts go out to those of you who lost loved ones, and our sincere thanks is owed to all who have assisted in the rescue, search, recovery, and rebuilding of that area.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my optimism that this is just the first of other bills affecting public lands that will become law this year. There has been bipartisan communication between the House and the Senate on finding agreement on a number of bills of local importance to communities across the country—bills to solve

problems, foster economic development, and to protect historic and special places. Had not the special circumstances prompted action on this bill today, I am confident it would have become law soon enough. Senator MURRAY and I, along with Senator CANTWELL, also from Washington State, have been discussing a number of bills of interest to our particular State. I hope and believe these will be among those that can be accomplished later on this year. It takes one step at a time, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill and send it to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Green Mountain Lookout tower is perched on a bluff overlooking Washington State's Cascade Mountains in what is now the Glacier Peak Wilderness. Built in the 1930s by the Civilian Conservation Corps, the tower is a popular destination for hikers and a testament to our long tradition of public lands-based service and training programs.

A lawsuit challenged the tower's presence in the wilderness area, and a judge ruled it be removed. Passage today of S. 404 will ensure the tower remains where it is, which we feel is important and appropriate. I want to thank Senator MURRAY of Washington and Representative DELBENE, the sponsor of the House companion. It is thanks to their hard work that we are considering this legislation today.

□ 1715

While it will not take away from the tragedy of the recent mudslide, passing this bill today will be a big win for the local community and the State of Washington as a whole.

We support the legislation and thank the majority and the chairman for bringing it up under suspension of the rules.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is the author of the House version of the Alaska provisions in this Senate bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

The Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act includes a provision that I offered as an amendment on the House floor in February. The amendment to the omnibus Public Access and Lands Improvement Act passed the House by voice vote, and I am pleased it has come before the House again as part of the Senate-passed legislation.

During the debate on that measure, I told a story that led to this provision, and how the Federal Government failed one of my constituents, Mr. William Alstrom, endangering his Alaska native veterans allotment and the cabin

he and his family built on their own effort on his land the Federal Government conveyed to him and then took back due to a bureaucratic error.

At its core, fixing issues like this is one we are all sent here to Washington to accomplish, and the way in which this has been fixed, merely months after I was first made aware of this issue, is an example of how Congress should function as we work together.

Today, after the House sends S. 404 to the President, I am pleased that William and his family can put this headache behind them, and William can put his time to better use by continuing to serve St. Mary's, Alaska, as mayor and president of his village corporation.

May I, again, thank the chairman, the ranking member, the two Senators, and the total Larsen delegation for this legislation, especially recognizing the mudslide.

But I hope we all recognize that the Federal Government is not a good manager of land. There are too many times that logic does not prevail and too many times they are being sued by interest groups that understand logic. I am suggesting respectfully, as the chairman has said, we ought to work together, both parties together, on solving land issues that are really created by our own government—both sides. I have been under eight Presidents, and I have watched these Presidents all not take into consideration individuals, their rights, their prerogatives, as free Americans.

So I, again, thank you for the efforts put forth in this legislation. I commend the chairman and ranking member for the work they put forth, and God bless you.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), the sponsor of the legislation.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their help in considering the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act today, a bill close to the hearts of many of my constituents who have been struck by a terrible tragedy.

As many in this Chamber know, on Saturday, March 22, on a mountainside in my district near the towns of Oso and Darrington, an enormous landslide occurred, almost unthinkable in size and scope, wiping out an entire neighborhood and destroying an important stretch of State Route 530, the primary transportation artery between Arlington and Darrington, and other communities to the east.

At least 33 people have lost their lives, and more are still missing. The damage and loss caused by this disaster are heartbreaking, but the community response has been equally inspiring. People throughout the region have come together to support each other and do their part to aid in the search and recovery.

In the days after the tragedy occurred, members of the community and

the mayor of Darrington asked for support on issues important to the region. One of their requests to our congressional delegation, to Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL and Congressman LARSEN and myself, was for our help to pass this bill.

Last year, I introduced the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act in the House, and, with unanimous Senate passage last week, we are one step closer to providing this community with a piece of good news about a treasured local landmark. The Green Mountain Lookout, located in the Glacier Peak Wilderness, was built in 1933 as a Civilian Conservation Corps project to detect fires and spot enemy aircraft during World War II. The lookout is a popular destination for hikers near and far, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is also an important, historic, and unique part of community of Darrington.

Unfortunately, severe weather caused the Green Mountain Lookout to fall into disrepair in 2001, and the U.S. Forest Service began taking steps to preserve the historic structure for future generations. However, an out-of-state group filed a lawsuit against the Forest Service for using machinery to conduct repairs and, unfortunately, a U.S. District Court ordered the Forest Service to remove the lookout. If Congress does not act soon, the lookout will be removed for good.

This lookout is a local landmark for the Darrington community and the Pacific Northwest, and is also a critical tourist attraction and economic driver in the region. At a time when this community is faced with a long, difficult road to recovery, we must do everything we can to help, including supporting the region's economy, and, in this case, protecting the Green Mountain Lookout saves a cherished landmark and supports outdoor recreation and tourism, both critically important to the local economy.

This bill is simple. It would allow routine maintenance while keeping this iconic structure where it is meant to be, and always has been, on Green Mountain near Darrington. Local governments in the area, my constituents, as well as a number of environmental and historic preservation groups, support saving the lookout. This bill also saves money because it would cost more money to remove the lookout than to keep it where it is.

The Green Mountain Lookout represents a significant piece of the Pacific Northwest's history. It deserves to be protected for outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy for many years to come.

This bill can't undo what has been done. But, as the mayor of Darrington told me, it can be a piece of good news and a victory for an inspiring community that has gone through so much.

Today, I ask all Members of the House to vote for this bill and do their part to support this remarkable community and this historic landmark.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 15½ minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the ranking member of the full committee, and the ranking member of the subcommittee for helping to bring S. 404 to the floor, the Green Mountain Lookout Heritage Protection Act.

The lookout symbolizes a unique and vanishing part of the Pacific Northwest's heritage, and this bill symbolizes Congress' solidarity with a hard-hit part of our State.

The Green Mountain Lookout is one of few surviving fire lookouts in the West. It is one of only six such lookouts within a wilderness area. It was an early warning station during World War II to alert citizens to possible aerial invasion.

The communities in nearby Darrington and Oso are recovering from last month's tragic landslide that has taken the lives of dozens of people and shut the communities off from much of the outside world. First responders, FEMA, and other Federal agencies have been extraordinary in their efforts to help with recovery.

Passing this bill invests in a longer-term economic recovery of the region. Many of the people in these communities rely on outdoor recreation and the tourism that it brings for their livelihoods. Part of that economy is based on access to its historic and beautiful location, like Green Mountain Lookout.

Keeping the lookout in place means Darrington has one more reason to tell people from across this country that Darrington is open for business. With the summer recreation season coming up, protecting Green Mountain Lookout sends a message from Congress to these communities as well that we are with you.

For 12 years, I represented these communities in Congress and for 3 years before that on the local county council. I introduced legislation identical to this bill in June 2012 right after an ill-advised court decision suggested that Green Mountain Lookout should be taken down.

I was pleased that Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL followed that with the introduction of companion legislation in December of 2012.

In February 2013, Congresswoman DELBENE reintroduced this bill, along with our Senate colleagues.

I appreciate my colleagues' willingness to protect the lookout, and I appreciate the support of Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and

others to put this bill on the President's desk.

By protecting the lookout, we will protect the economic livelihoods of many of those who have struggled after last month's tragic landslide.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to vote for S. 404.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from Arizona I am prepared to close if he is prepared to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I think the Representatives from Washington stated the case for the legislation. All of us concur with that.

I urge all Members to vote for this piece of legislation. It is thoughtful, it is pragmatic, and it is necessary to do it with some urgency so that that historic site is not lost.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a good piece of legislation. I want to congratulate my colleagues from the western part of the State for introducing it and persevering on it.

It is just one of those issues, as I mentioned in my opening statement, where we many times in the West get influenced by somebody out of State. This is just one of those classic examples. There is no reason why the lookout should not be there for the people that surround the community of Darrington, and for the people that hike in that area.

But so many times I have come to the floor, and colleagues on my side, arguing about lawsuits, especially from the environmental emphasis. This is just one more example that we are correcting. In fact, I hope we can have more of those in the future.

This is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 404.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4323) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4323

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2014”.

#### SEC. 2. GENERAL REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2010 through 2018” and inserting “2014 through 2019”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2018” and inserting “2019”; and

(2) in subsection (j), by striking “2009 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

#### SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136(b)) is amended by striking “2009 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

#### SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(c) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136a(c)) is amended by striking “2009 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4323, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1989, Debbie Smith was kidnapped from her Williamsburg, Virginia, home while her husband, a police officer, was sleeping upstairs. Her assailant dragged her into the woods behind her home and raped her.

Despite being threatened with further harm, she bravely came forward, reported the assault, and consented to a forensic exam with hopes that her attacker would be quickly identified and apprehended. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

In the years following the sexual assault, Debbie Smith, stricken with thoughts of suicide, struggled with the paralyzing fear that her unknown attacker would return to inflict harm on her and her family. The traumatic effect remained with Debbie and her family for over 6 years until an offender was identified and convicted using DNA analysis.

I am pleased to sponsor H.R. 4323, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2014, to ensure victims of rape, sexual assault, and other violent crimes do not have to endure similar experiences

to Debbie Smith in the future. I would like to acknowledge the bipartisan support received from the numerous cosponsors of this important legislation, including lead cosponsor Congresswoman BASS of California and original cosponsors Ranking Member CONYERS, Crime Subcommittee Chairman SENBRENNER, and Ranking Member SCOTT. I also would like to recognize the efforts of my colleague from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, in cosponsoring this bill reauthorizing the program she helped create in 2004. Finally, the gentleman from Texas, Judge TED POE, has also been a strong leader in this area for many years, and we are all very appreciative of his efforts.

With the goal of eliminating the backlog of untested DNA samples, the Debbie Smith program awards grants to State and local governments to fund the collection of samples from offenders and crime scenes, including rape kits, increased laboratory capacity, and the analysis of DNA samples in a timely and appropriate manner.

□ 1730

Additionally, grants are authorized to provide training, technical assistance, and education to law enforcement officials, court officers, corrections personnel, and forensic science and medical professionals.

The effectiveness of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestioned. As of January 2014, the use of the FBI's National DNA Index has provided important assistance in more than 224,000 investigations. In my home State of Virginia, the database contains more than 366,000 offender profiles and has aided in nearly 8,500 criminal investigations.

Due to a number of factors, including the expansion in recent years of the number of States requiring arrestees to submit DNA samples, the demand for the testing of these samples continues to outpace the capacity of State and local government laboratories.

In 2011, laboratories processed 10 percent more DNA cases than in 2009. However, backlogs persisted as demand grew by 16 percent during the same period, illustrating the need for the continued support of this vital program.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, reauthorizing the Debbie Smith program, to continue the reduction of DNA backlogs nationwide.

I thank Debbie Smith for her contribution to this effort and for her courage in standing up for millions of others.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4323, the Debbie Smith Act, which was originally enacted in 2004. During Sexual Assault Awareness Month, we have the opportunity to take an important step in continuing a program that helps address the problem of sexual assault.

The Debbie Smith Act has helped State and local law enforcement reduce the Nation's large backlog of untested DNA samples. Grants are used to hire personnel and to purchase supplies for processing samples and for including them in the Combined DNA Index System.

Grants have also been directed to DNA training and technical assistance for law enforcement and courts and to sexual assault nurse examiner programs. Crime laboratories have almost unanimously reported that the DNA Backlog Grant Program is essential to their capacity to process samples, but the backlog still remains.

Hundreds of thousands of DNA samples, each representing an unsolved crime, remains untested. Regrettably, over 200 untested samples remain in Los Angeles alone that have outlasted the statute of limitations for prosecuting cases, so we have to do everything we can to process these samples.

We must also do everything we can to strengthen the nationwide database and reduce the DNA backlog, so that cases of sexual assault can be solved and prosecuted without delay. Reauthorizing the Debbie Smith Act will bring perpetrators of sexual assault to justice before they can attack more victims.

I am proud to acknowledge that Debbie Smith is a constituent of mine. She lives in Charles City County, Virginia. She waited more than 6 years for the DNA from her rape kit to be processed and checked against the national database in order to identify her attacker.

Her attacker was identified, but unfortunately, during those 6 years, he attacked at least two other women—crimes that would not have happened if his DNA had been tested in a more timely manner.

Debbie has spent her time and effort over the last few years with her organization, HEART, which stands for Hope Exists After Rape Trauma. She has been advocating for a reduction in the DNA backlog and has been offering assistance to victims of sexual assault.

I commend my colleague from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, for working together to expedite the consideration of this bill.

I also want to acknowledge the original author of the Debbie Smith Act, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), for her hard work and continued advocacy on behalf of sexual assault victims.

I urge my colleagues to join me in further honoring the work of Debbie Smith's by voting for this bill—to reauthorize the bill that bears her name.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that demonstrates that members of different parties with different philosophies can come together when the cause is so clear and straightforward, and we come here today, supporting the 4-year reauthorization of three programs established under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

These programs facilitate a holistic approach to the use of DNA in sexual assault cases by providing Federal grants to address the huge DNA backlogs and to provide DNA training and technical assistance to States and local law enforcement agencies.

The Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program is named for Debbie Smith who, as my dear friend Mr. SCOTT has indicated, was kidnapped from her home and was raped in nearby woods.

The attacker remained unidentified for more than 6 years until a DNA sample, collected from a convicted person who was serving time in a Virginia State prison for other crimes, revealed his identity as her attacker. The delay in identifying her attacker caused Debbie Smith untold psychological and emotional torture.

I am very pleased by the fact that, along with Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Mr. SCOTT and Judge POE, we were able to meet with Mrs. Smith and her husband, who honor us by witnessing this proceeding that is now going on.

I want to commend not only the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, and the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, BOBBY SCOTT, but also JIM SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin and Judge POE, who all have worked so hard to make this law work.

We are reducing the backlog, but the person who championed this issue the most was CAROLYN MALONEY, and I am happy to recommend her for the commendation that she deserves.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who has been working hard on this issue for a number of years.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4323, the Debbie Smith Act.

Every 2 minutes in this country, someone is sexually assaulted. That means, by the time I finish my remarks today, at least one man, woman, or child will have been brutally attacked.

By the end of this year, more than 200,000 people—nearly all of them women and girls—will have been victimized in the most inhuman way. Only 60 percent of victims will ever report their attacks, and barely 3 percent of attackers will ever serve a day in prison.

These statistics are staggering, and we are not doing all we can to ensure

that every victim has access to the justice he deserves. Too often, victims who are willing to report their attacks face invasive examinations, which leave them feeling victimized all over again.

They then wait, often living in fear and with no information from law enforcement, while their rape kits collect dust in evidence lockers or sit on lab shelves. Every untested rape kit is a lost opportunity to provide justice and to catch dangerous criminals.

To see the importance of rape kit testing, look no further than New York City. In 1999, the city enacted a policy to test every rape kit and to eliminate its backlog of over 17,000 kits, and 15 years later, that policy has made a world of difference.

Every kit collected in New York is tested within 30 to 60 days, and the arrest rate for rape has skyrocketed from 40 percent to 70 percent. Compare that to the national rate of 24 percent. Clearly, the more rape kits we test, the more rapists we get off the streets.

Imagine what would happen if we tested all of the 400,000 rape kits that are still sitting on the shelves today around the country.

I have fought to end the rape kit backlog for nearly 15 years. In 2000, I supported the passage of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act, which provided \$40 million to help States analyze DNA evidence.

When the rape kit backlog failed to decrease by 2002, I introduced the Rape Kit DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act, which would have authorized \$250 million to help police departments finance rape kit testing.

In 2004, I cosponsored and worked closely with Mr. SENSENBRENNER and others to enact the Justice for All Act that created the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, which authorized hundreds of millions of dollars for DNA testing and strengthened the ability of State and local law enforcement to test rape kits.

While I am pleased that we will reauthorize the Debbie Smith Grant Program today, I am disappointed that we are not considering a complete reauthorization of the Justice for All Act, including the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Grant programs.

DNA evidence is vital to providing justice for all people by putting violent criminals behind bars and by exonerating wrongfully convicted individuals. We should not allow a vital program to lapse because it is less politically expedient.

It is my hope that we can work together to pass a complete reauthorization of the Justice for All Act as our colleagues in the Senate claim to do shortly. In the 10 years since the creation of the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, we have seen much progress, but the backlog continues to be a major problem, and prosecuting is uneven across the country.

I commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member and all

of the other Members who have worked on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill and to work towards a day when no rape kit goes untested and every victim of sexual assault sees justice.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the author of the original legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you, and I thank all of my colleagues for this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important thing a government can do than protect its citizens from violent crime, and today's reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act, until 2019, does just that. It will protect women, and it will save lives.

The Debbie Smith Act has been called the most important antirape legislation ever to have passed this Congress. During Sexual Assault Awareness Month, April, we are presented with the grim statistics that every 2 minutes, someone is sexually assaulted in our country.

This bill was first introduced in 2001, after a hearing Steve Horn and I organized on the use of DNA to convict and exonerate. Since first being signed into law in 2004, the Debbie Smith Act funds have provided State and local governments with the tools to eliminate the backlog that exists around this country.

It is estimated the backlog is of roughly 400,000 kits that are sitting in warehouses and police departments, and each one of these kits is representing a life of a woman who has been raped.

It not only represents a peace of mind for her to know that her rapist will be convicted and put behind bars, but it will prevent future rapes because the FBI tells us that most rapists will attack another seven times; so, if we can convict, we can save seven other lives.

□ 1745

I want to recognize two extremely brave women who are speaking out on this issue and have testified before Congress. It is very difficult to do. I have tried to get people to testify. The only person I could get to testify was my good friend, Debbie Smith, who inspired me and others after her wonderful testimony in 2001. She is also joined by Natasha Alexenko, founder of Natasha's Justice Project, working to completely eliminate the backlog. Natasha's and Debbie's stories tell the need of this legislation.

My friend, Congressman SCOTT, spoke about his constituent, Debbie. Natasha was raped, and it took 15 years for them to process her kit. During that 15 years, her rapist raped other women, was involved in sex trafficking, selling

drugs, and a slew of other crimes across this country. When her kit was processed, he was put behind bars. If they had processed it earlier, it would have prevented all of this other damage to women and to society as a whole.

One of the tragic costs of this type of crime is that those who survive a sexual assault carry wounds that are not readily visible. They are 3 times more likely to suffer from depression, 13 times more likely to abuse alcohol, 26 times more likely to abuse drugs, and 4 times more likely to contemplate suicide. Each rape kit that gets tested brings these survivors closer to justice and prevents future rapes.

Since I introduced the first version of this legislation in 2001, it has always received wide bipartisan support. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, members of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. POE, Ms. BASS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT, and former Congressman Mark Green for all of their hard work.

I hope that this bill will quickly pass the Senate and become law. This is one of those rare bills that virtually guarantees that it will put real criminals behind bars and protect people more effectively from one of the most traumatic assaults imaginable: rape. The grants provided to States and local governments will allow them to significantly reduce or eliminate their backlogs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. By using a national DNA database, it helps them identify criminals.

The bill that Mr. POE and I passed earlier this year, the SAFER Act, will direct that 75 percent of this money go directly for the backlog. It is roughly \$113 million. It is important. It is a moral imperative to eliminate the rape backlog so that women will not be victimized simply because their government failed to act and failed to process this important evidence.

This is an important day. I urge my colleagues to unanimously pass this bill and move it to the Senate and unanimously pass it there.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, and Mrs. MALONEY for their leadership.

I was on the Crime Subcommittee as this bill was introduced. I was eager to see it work its will in that early timeframe in the backdrop of the courage of Debbie Smith. I also recognize Natasha Alexenko, who I understand is a con-

stituent of Mr. SCOTT. Those were the early days in 2001 when we were finding out all over the Nation that rape kits were actually lost. My city was no different.

This is an important reauthorization because of the grant programs that are provided. In particular, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act authorizes \$151 million in grants for State and local DNA labs to address DNA backlogs. As I indicated, in my own hometown, we were faced with backlogs and lost kits as well.

The DNA training and technical assistance is extremely important, helping law enforcement, courts, and forensic scientists. For DNA training and technical assistance, \$30 million is directed to Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner programs.

There is nothing more lonely than to be raped and then, on top of it, not see your case pursued.

I want to thank the Houston Area Women's Center, which involves itself in sexual violence against women, as well as Kathryn Griffin, who has worked with prostitutes and others who have actually been raped.

In Houston, decades-old rape kits that sat untested have identified at least one-third of potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department. And I congratulate the city of Houston. Combined with dollars from the Debbie Smith Reauthorization and the city's own investment, we now have a new DNA lab that is open and ready for business to ensure that the victims of crime and sexual assault are not left along the highway of despair. In my district alone, 6,600 rape kits have been cleared as of August 2013. That is an important step forward.

I also look forward to continuing to work on issues dealing with DNA of those who involve themselves in human trafficking in a national database.

I also want to give another reason why this is extremely important. As I left Houston, in my own congressional district, we found that, unfortunately, the State of Texas decided to put 23 violent sexual offenders in a neighborhood in what is called a halfway house. Those individuals are at the back side of their incarceration. Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is a dangerous set of circumstances when these individuals will be among children and women and be without the necessary security in a neighborhood.

And so this DNA for rape kits is one aspect of the need that is being addressed in helping women, again, not feel lonely and left without refuge and the ability to access justice.

I support H.R. 4323. I ask my colleagues to support it, and remember there is a larger and broader picture we must look at in order to address the violence against women.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of both the Judiciary Committee and a co-sponsor, I

rise in strong support of H.R. 4323, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2014," which reauthorizes three grant programs to address DNA backlogs and provide DNA training and technical assistance on local, state, and federal levels.

It is essential that these programs be reauthorized so that the backlog of unprocessed rape kits can be reduced and then eliminated and perpetrators of sexual assault crimes can be prosecuted and convicted.

There is an ever-present need to continue robust funding for programs such as the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program in order to make sure victims do not fall through the cracks of the system.

Women who have been raped have a right to expect police to thoroughly investigate the case and prosecute the offenders; however, many rape kits across the country are never even tested, and the perpetrators never face justice.

Mr. Speaker, the number of backlogged DNA samples was in excess of 100,000 nationwide as recently as January 2010.

H.R. 4323 reauthorizes for four years (until the end of fiscal year 2019) the following programs:

1. "Debbie Smith Reauthorization" (\$151 million/fiscal year): grants for state and local DNA crime laboratories to address DNA backlogs and enhance their capacity.

2. DNA training and technical assistance (\$12.5 million/fiscal year): directed to law enforcement, courts, forensic scientists, and corrections.

3. DNA training and technical assistance (\$30 million/fiscal year): directed to sexual assault nurse examiner ("SANE") programs.

In my congressional district, these grant programs have resulted in forensic laboratories being hired to clear much of the Houston Police Department's backlog of untested DNA benefit from this type of legislation.

Just within the past year, decades-old rape kits that sat untested in Houston have identified at least one-third of potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department.

In my district more than 6,600 rape kits have been cleared as of August 2013 because of the funding made possible by the grant programs that H.R. 4323 will reauthorize. This record of success highlights the importance and continuing need to provide adequate funding so law enforcement agencies can conduct necessary DNA testing and training.

Mr. Speaker, the DNA Initiative is an invaluable tool for law enforcement today, and it will continue to be a legislative priority of mine. That is why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 4323 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this critically important legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to encourage my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. I thank my colleague from Virginia for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I recognize the many people who have worked very hard to bring us to the reauthorization today of this important legislation.

I particularly want to thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her leadership from the original legislation to today. Congresswoman KAREN BASS of California unfortunately could not be with us for this debate this evening, but she has played a role as the lead cosponsor of this legislation. I thank the ranking member of the full committee and the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SCOTT, for their hard work on this as well.

I certainly thank the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for his contribution, as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his work in this area on this and other legislation affecting crimes against women.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation that will help avoid many, many future victims. I really thank Debbie Smith and Natasha Alexenko for being with us when we talked about this issue this afternoon. I want to thank them for their courage in speaking out about it. They are not only helping to have a better understanding on the part of the public of the nature of this problem, but they are actually helping to fight crime.

This Congress will be helping to fight crime when we get these perpetrators of these horrific events much, much more quickly than these multiyear delays that we have heard about tonight. We need to get them quickly. We need to prosecute the guilty. We need to exonerate the innocent and put the guilty ones in prison, where they cannot perpetrate more of these crimes. Some of them are out on the streets for additional years perpetrating multitudinous crimes. This is a serious problem. It will save the taxpayers money by reducing the amount of crime that is perpetrated in our society.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4323.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1820

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

#### BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1872 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DeLauro moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1872, as reported, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

#### TITLE IV—EQUAL PAY AND PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS

##### SEC. 401. EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN AND PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS FROM HIGHER LOAN COSTS.

(a) EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN.—This Act shall not take effect until the female-to-male earnings ratio of full-time, year-round workers is at least 100 percent, as reported by the Bureau of the Census pursuant to the data collected from any Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

(b) PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES AND CONSUMERS.—This Act shall not apply to any loan for a small business, student, agriculture, or for veterans' housing if such Act increases the cost of such loan and credit programs for small businesses and consumers due to the elimination or reduction of Federal support.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This amendment works to end pay discrimination against women, and it helps to ensure a very simple principle, one I hope that everyone in this body agrees with: men, women, same job, same pay, because it is true in this body.

Tomorrow is the dubious milestone of Equal Pay Day, the day a women's earnings catch up to what a man made last year. We are now over 3 full months into 2014. Women should not have to work an extra quarter of a year to be paid what they are due.

My amendment would postpone the effective date of the bill under consideration until Congress has worked to close this pay gap. It also ensures that this act does not increase the cost of loan and credit programs for small businesses, students, farmers, and veterans as a result of an elimination or reduction of Federal support.

Paycheck discrimination is not a partisan issue. It affects every woman. It affects every family in America. Nearly 60 years ago, a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, told the Congress that "legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice."

Over 50 years ago, Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion to pass the Equal Pay Act and end what President Kennedy called "the serious and endemic problem of unequal wages."

In 2014, women are still making 77 cents on average for every dollar made by a man. This wage gap is only closing at a rate of less than one-half a cent a year. That means we still have 40 more years before women will get paid what they deserve for the same work.

Families cannot afford to wait that long. They should not have to. That is why we just saw the Republican-controlled Senate in New Hampshire pass a paycheck fairness bill unanimously because this is an issue of simple fairness—same job, same pay—that affects everyone.

Women are half the workforce in America today, two-thirds of the primary cobreadwinners in American families. The poverty rate among women is as high as it has been in 17 years. Women have less retirement security, less protection on their pension, and more reliance on Social Security, but they receive lower payments because of this continuing wage gap.

As a result, two-thirds of seniors living in poverty today in the United States of America are women. These disproportionate financial pressures that women are facing are very much a product of this wage gap.

According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, women lose \$11,000 in income every year as a result of pay discrimination. This pay gap has not budged in a decade. For women of color, it is even worse. African American women make only 62 cents as compared to the average White male; Hispanic women, only 54 cents.

The pay gap holds true across occupations and education levels. This is not just a problem for women. Less pay for women means less income. That affects an entire family. Two-income households are already struggling.

This is not a partisan issue. Unequal pay affects families all across our

country. What are they trying to do? Pay their bills, achieve the American Dream, and they are getting less take-home pay for their hard work.

We have heard it from AnnMarie DuChon in Massachusetts. She found out years into her job that the university she worked for was paying men more for the same work.

Terri Kelly in Tennessee only discovered she was making less than she deserved because her husband held the exact same job, and she saw his paycheck.

ReShonda Young of Iowa discovered that her own father was paying women less when she went to work in the family business. This is real.

Both Republicans and Democrats agree that people doing the same job should receive the same pay. This amendment reaffirms our commitment to this basic principle.

It also says that we are not going to force small businesses and consumers, who are working hard, playing by the rules, and trying to make a better future for themselves, to pay more because of their skill.

Mr. Speaker, we made an enormous difference for women and families when we passed the Affordable Care Act in March 2010. We said to insurance companies: you cannot charge women more than men.

That is the law of the land today. It is real, it is being implemented, and it is happening right now. Now, we should build on that.

Let us make sure that employers cannot pay women less for the same job. This makes all the difference in their lives and the lives of their families. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a number of questions come to my mind after just hearing the sponsor of the motion. They don't necessarily go in this order.

One is: Why does she want to hide from the American public the actual facts of what they are doing to the American public, as far as spending the taxpayers' money?

The second question that comes to mind is: Why, when the opportunity was given to the other side of the aisle to work with us, to amend the bill or change the bill on those areas that they disagree with on its merits, why did they instead come with this proposal, this motion on the floor totally extraneous to the underlying message and purpose of the bill?

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, many times we come to the floor and people say that the bill before us is a commonsense piece of legislation. Well, I am going to say it again because this is a commonsense piece of legislation. The underlying

bill, maybe we should have had a different name to it. Maybe if we simply called the bill what it is, the "Knowing What You Are Spending Bill," then the other side of the aisle would have agreed with us, wrapped their arms around the bill and us and said let's move forward, because who can disagree with actually know what you are spending?

That is all this bill does. It doesn't eliminate any programs; it doesn't cut any programs; and it doesn't diminish any programs. All it does is allow Congress and the American public to understand what we are spending and what the costs are to the various programs that both sides of the aisle support.

The proponent just now of the motion didn't get into the weeds at all. But let me just, for those just coming to the floor, remind them of what the major provisions of the underlying bill do. There are a number of them. I will give you three highlights.

First and foremost, it brings Federal budgeting in line with what the private sector has already been doing for a long time. It requires the executive branch and Congress to use something called fair value accounting when estimating the cost of Federal credit programs. What does that mean? Again, it just means that, when we spend American taxpayers' dollars, we have to let the taxpayers know how much it is actually costing.

This is not just my idea. This is what the private sector has been doing. This is even what the nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, says we should be doing as well.

The second point is it brings Fannie and Freddie on budget. Why do we do that? To recognize the enormous and potential budgetary impact that these housing-related enterprises can and have had on our government. I don't think I have to remind either side of the aisle that they have cost upwards to \$187 billion in taxpayer dollars to get it done, and we want to make sure it is on the budget so we can see it clearly.

Thirdly and lastly, this bill would require agencies to make public the budgetary justification for the materials prepared in support of their programs. What is that saying? It just means that, if you have an agency out there that wants to spend your tax dollars, they have to have the justification for it.

I think those are three honest and fair proposals that the American public has a right to know. We can continue to help the poor; we can continue to have ag programs; we can continue to have energy programs; and we can continue to have programs that facilitate housing in this country. But as we do on those programs that we both agree on, let's make sure that we are being honest with the American public and telling them and knowing what it actually costs.

For that reason, I recommend a "no" on this motion to recommit that would

eliminate that possibility for transparency, accountability, and openness, and a “yes” on the final passage of the legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 217, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—179

Barber	Grayson	Nadler
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	Napolitano
Beatty	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Grijalva	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Hahn	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Bonamici	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Honda	Pocan
Butterfield	Horsford	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Huffman	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cartwright	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kaptur	Rush
Ciциlline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	T.
Clay	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kind	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kuster	Schiff
Connolly	Langevin	Schneider
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Levin	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lewis	Serrano
Cummings	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Sherman
DeGette	Lowenthal	Sinema
Delaney	Lowey	Sires
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
DelBene	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Dingell	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Doggett	Lynch	Takano
Doyle	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Duckworth	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Carolyn	Tierney
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Engel	Matheson	Tonko
Enyart	Matsui	Tsongas
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
Esty	McCollum	Vargas
Farr	McDermott	Veasey
Fattah	McGovern	Vela
Foster	McIntyre	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Walz
Fudge	Meng	Waters
Gabbard	Michaud	Waxman
Galleo	Miller, George	Welch
Garamendi	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NAYS—217

Aderholt	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Amash	Grimm	Pittenger
Amodei	Guthrie	Pitts
Bachmann	Hall	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Harper	Pompeo
Barletta	Hartzler	Posey
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Benishak	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bentivolio	Hensarling	Reichert
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ribble
Blackburn	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Calvert	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jones	Roskam
Cantor	Jordan	Ross
Capito	Joyce	Rothfus
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Chabot	King (IA)	Runyan
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Kingston	Salmon
Coffman	Kinzing (IL)	Sanford
Cole	Kline	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Lance	Sessions
Cooper	Lankford	Shimkus
Costa	Latham	Shuster
Cotton	Latta	Simpson
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stivers
Dent	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tipton
Ellmers	McKinley	Turner
Farenthold	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wagner
Fleming	Meehan	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walden
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Noem	Wittman
Gibbs	Nugent	Wolf
Gibson	Nunes	Womack
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gosar	Olson	Yoder
Govdy	Palazzo	Yoho
Granger	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Pearce	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Perry	

NOT VOTING—35

Barr	Gohmert	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Griffin (AR)	Payne
Black	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hanna	Perlmutter
Buchanan	Harris	Richmond
Campbell	Keating	Schock
Cárdenas	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Carter	McAllister	Stewart
DeFazio	Meeks	Visclosky
Denham	Miller, Gary	Wasserman
Fingher	Moran	Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Neal	Westmoreland

□ 1857

Mr. FARENTHOLD changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GRIJALVA, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. GABBARD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 165, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Granger	Nugent
Amash	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Nunnelee
Bachmann	Grayson	Olson
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Owens
Barber	Grimm	Palazzo
Barletta	Guthrie	Paulsen
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Pearce
Barton	Harper	Perry
Benishak	Hartzler	Peters (CA)
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pitts
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Holding	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Posey
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Quigley
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Reed
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Reichert
Bucshon	Hurt	Renacci
Burgess	Issa	Ribble
Byrne	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Capito	Jones	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Coble	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Coffman	King (NY)	Rokita
Cole	Kingston	Rooney
Collins (GA)	Kinzing (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (NY)	Kline	Roskam
Conaway	Labrador	Ross
Cook	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Cooper	Lamborn	Royce
Costa	Lance	Runyan
Cotton	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Latham	Salmon
Crawford	Latta	Sanford
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Scalise
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Schrader
Culberson	Long	Schweikert
Daines	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Lummis	Sessions
DeSantis	Maffei	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Marchant	Shuster
Duffy	Marino	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Sinema
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Ellmers	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Fleischmann	McIntyre	Southerland
Fleming	McKeon	Stivers
Flores	McKinley	Stockman
Forbes	McMorris	Stutzman
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Terry
Fox	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Thornberry
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Tiberi
Galleo	Mica	Tipton
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Turner
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Upton
Gerlach	Mullin	Valadao
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Wagner
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Walberg
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Walden
Gosar	Neugebauer	Walorski
Govdy	Noem	Weber (TX)
		Webster (FL)

Wenstrup  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—165

Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Green, Al

Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pelosi  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Walz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—36

Barr  
Bass  
Black  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Campbell  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carter  
DeFazio  
Denham  
Diaz-Balart  
Fincher

Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Griffin (AR)  
Gutiérrez  
Hanna  
Harris  
Keating  
Larson (CT)  
McAllister  
Meeks  
Miller, Gary  
Moran  
Neal

Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Richmond  
Schock  
Schwartz  
Stewart  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Westmoreland

□ 1904

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 90, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 90

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

## SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 30, 2014, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 94

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DENNY HECK, be removed as a cosponsor from H. Con. Res. 94.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## SHANNON MELENDI'S DEATH STINGS, 20 YEARS LATER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some words written by Anne Vasquez about the tragic loss of a teen from my Miami high school:

Shannon Melendi and I became fast friends. Tears still sting my eyes when I think of the final chapters of Shannon's short life.

At 19, a sophomore at Emory, she disappeared on a Saturday afternoon lunch break from her job at a softball field in suburban Atlanta.

The year was 1994. It would be another painful 12 years before the suspect confessed. Shannon's body was never found. No funeral, no official moment to mourn. The last 20 years have unfolded in surreal fashion.

A smart 19-year-old with quick wit, the president of her high school senior class, an aspiring lawyer, a champion debater, the daughter of present and caring parents—it can happen to anyone, anywhere.

Indeed.

Thank you, Anne. Shannon, we'll always remember you.

## A THREAT TO LIBERTY IN UKRAINE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, a threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere.

Freedom's bell rings now for nations around our world to choose between the fledgling democracy of Ukraine or the dictatorship of Russia.

As the Russian bear eats its way through Ukraine's easternmost regions with abandon, the scene seems almost surreal as the world waits while Putin's pushes his illegal aggregation further.

The questions for freedom loving nations are:

Who defines freedom's edge for Ukraine? Surely, not Russia. Where does the edge of defiance stop? And who will push the bear back in its cage?

Aggressor Putin says he will send Russian peacekeeping forces to the nation he has just invaded illegally. That would be a line for "Saturday Night Live" if it were not so real.

When the Budapest Accords were signed in 1994 and Ukraine voluntarily gave up the third-largest cache of nuclear weapons on Earth, it was left defenseless, but was promised by our government, the United Kingdom, and Russia to respect the independence, sovereignty, and existing borders of Ukraine.

So let me ask our government, the United Kingdom, and Russia: Do words mean anything, or were they merely artful conveniences at the time?

Now, let me ask NATO nations: Where is the edge of liberty you will defend?

## THE CAMEL STATUE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States State Department is on an art spending spree.

First, it spent \$1 million for a granite statue at the London Embassy. It is modern art. It looks like a stack of bricks.

Now it has spent \$400,000 for a statue of a camel that will be sent to the Embassy in Pakistan. Is this really necessary? I mean, a camel?

This is an example of spending somebody else's money. This ought to be embarrassing to the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, there is more.

This is the same State Department that the inspector general has recently said has lost or misplaced \$6 billion. The State Department cannot account for this money. Where, oh, where has the taxpayer money gone? If any business lost \$6 billion its shareholders would be mad and want answers. But the government gives no answers, and what money it has it wastes on camel statues.

Congress should pass my bipartisan bill with Mr. CONNOLLY, the Foreign Aid Accountability Act, and make the State Department account for the money it spends, otherwise more lost money, more camel statues, more art spending sprees.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1915

#### AMERICA'S MORAL COMPASS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have always viewed the budget document that is produced by this House and the Senate and the President as a moral compass of America's commitment to her people.

That is why I rise with such great disappointment on the Republican Ryan budget in that today, as we speak in the Rules Committee, we are gutting investments in education, scientific research, advanced manufacturing. We are cutting from those vital transportation investments by over \$52 billion when we have crumbling highways and crumbling dams and crumbling infrastructure. We are slashing \$145 billion from the very heart of our children's opportunity for education out of the Pell grants, providing millionaires with over \$200,000 in a tax break, ending Medicare as we know it by vouchering it—almost like the privatization of Social Security—and cutting Medicaid by \$732 billion, then ending the opportunity for Americans to have access to affordable health care, preventative health care, so as to be able to allow those who need health care to have it—to avoid being a third world country.

There are 25 million Americans who need access to health care. Let's get a better moral document and reject this present Republican budget.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF TROOPS TO THE TRACK

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Troops to the Track's fifth anniversary.

A partnership between the Armed Forces Foundation and NASCAR, Troops to the Track is a recreational group therapy program for service-members, veterans, and their families. Now in its fifth year, Troops to the Track has reached more than 2,000 individuals since its inception. I am humbled to be part of this initiative.

Last year, I was honored to join participating soldiers and their families from the 19th Engineer Battalion at Fort Knox for last year's Quaker State 400 at the Kentucky Speedway.

I would like to commend the Armed Forces Foundation and NASCAR for joining together in the creation of this important partnership and in giving our troops the recognition they so richly deserve.

#### SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PAYMENTS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the United States Department of Agriculture announced that over \$300 million would soon be paid out to States through the Secure Rural Schools program in order to compensate for the lost local revenue because of a lack of timber harvesting in national forests.

Last year, the administration decided to retroactively apply 2013 sequestration cuts to the 2012 SRS funds, and it requested the repayment of \$17.9 million that has already been distributed to States and counties. This decision immediately sparked bipartisan opposition, prompting the House Committee on Natural Resources to conduct an investigation into the administration's legally questionable actions. The investigation found that the White House ordered the sequestration cuts for the SRS program and that the administration chose to apply the reductions in a manner that made certain that all Secure Rural Schools counties felt the hurt.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the administration chose against playing more politics with this program at the expense of our rural communities, including those which I represent in the Allegheny National Forest, but in the long run, rural communities wouldn't need additional funding through this program if we actually harvested the proper levels of timber on these taxpayer-owned lands.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL FERGUSON

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Sergeant First Class Daniel Ferguson.

Sergeant Ferguson grew up in Polk County, Florida, where he attended Mulberry High School and played tight end for the football team. He was a member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and was a member of the Future Business Leaders of America. His classmates and teachers remember him fondly as a person of great character, kindness, and respect.

After graduating, he joined the Army in 1993. He served with distinction in

Afghanistan, Iraq, and Kuwait, earning a Bronze Star, three Meritorious Service Medals, and five Army Commendation Medals, amongst many others. He returned from Afghanistan last year.

Last week, on April 2, Sergeant Ferguson was shot and killed on Fort Hood in a tragedy that left three killed and 16 more wounded.

On behalf of the people of the 17th District of Florida and Florida's heartland, I send my deepest condolences to the family of Sergeant First Class Ferguson as well as to the families of Sergeant Carlos Rodriguez and Sergeant Timothy Owens.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2030

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM APRIL 11, 2014, THROUGH APRIL 25, 2014

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-405) on the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, and providing for proceedings during the period from April 11, 2014, through April 25, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 8, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2014 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 20, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Michael Turner .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		1,870.00				3,188.00
Hon. Lois Frankel .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		9,755.00				11,073.00
Hon. Brett Guthrie .....	2/15	2/17	Belgium .....		947.00		2,510.00				3,457.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez .....	2/15	2/20	Belgium .....		1,318.00		10,760.00				12,078.00
Hon. Rob Bishop .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		1,835.00				3,153.00
Hon. Tom Marino .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		8,105.00				9,423.00
Jeff Dressler .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		1,835.00				3,153.00
Janice Robinson .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		1,835.00				3,153.00
Marcus Micheli .....	2/15	2/18	Belgium .....		1,318.00		1,835.00				3,153.00
Committee total .....					11,491.00		40,340.00				51,831.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, Mar. 17, 2014.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5218. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Benzoic Acid [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-1100] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5219. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Third Party Payment of Qualified Health Plan Premiums [CMS-9943-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AS28) received March 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5220. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drug Applications; Confidentiality of Data and Information in a New Animal Drug Application File [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0108] received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5221. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D2 Bakers Yeast [Docket No.: FDA-2009-F-0570] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5222. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans; (Negative Declarations) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont; Withdrawal of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Hampshire; Technical Corrections to Approved State Plans (Negative Declarations); Rhode Island and Vermont [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0707; A-1-FRL-9908-37-Region 1] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5223. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Heat-killed Burkholderia spp. Strain A396 Cells and Spent Fermentation Media; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0012; FRL-9907-41] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5224. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Iponazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0796; FRL-9907-25] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5225. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Infrastructure Requirements for Lead (Pb) [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0663; FRL-9908-09-Region 9] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5226. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Idaho State Implementation Plan; Approval of Fine Particulate Matter Control Measures; Franklin County [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0002; FRL-9908-38-Region 10] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5227. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol (AMP) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0775; FRL-9906-73-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR92) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5228. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; PSD Rules for PM2.5 [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0646; FRL-9908-72-Region 5] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5229. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Penn-

sylvania; Carbon Monoxide Second Limited Maintenance Plan for the Pittsburgh Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0248; FRL-9908-48-Region 3] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5230. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Reading 1997 Eight-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0589; FRL-9908-50-Region 3] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5231. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0211; FRL-9908-46-Region 3] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5232. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Approval of the Redesignation Requests and the Associated Maintenance Plans of the Charleston Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0090; FRL-9908-88-Region 3] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5233. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Conflict of Interest [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0285; FRL-9909-01-Region 4] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5234. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Commonwealth of Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R03-

OAR-2013-0164; FRL-9908-89-Region 3] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5235. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Texas; Revisions to the Minor New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Types of Standard Permits, State Pollution Control Project Standard Permit and Control Methods for the Permitting of Grandfathered and Electing Electric Generating Facilities [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0191; FRL-9908-27-Region 6] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5236. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of States' Requests to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Volatility Standard in Florida, and the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point Areas in North Carolina [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0787; FRL-9908-13-OAR] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5237. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clomazone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0056; FRL-9907-62] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5238. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Forchlorfenuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0011; FRL-9907-47] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5239. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Kraft Pulp Mills NSPS Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0640; FRL-9907-37-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR64) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5240. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0051; FRL-9907-05] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5241. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0171; FRL-9908-25-Region 9] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5242. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Maricopa [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0576; FRL-9904-75-Region 9] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5243. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0926; FRL-9907-61] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5244. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; (GSAR); Electronic Contracting Initiative (ECI) [(Change 56); GSAR Case 2012-G501; Docket No. 2013-0006; Sequence No. 1] received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5245. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 120416009-4095-02] (RIN: 0648-BB78) received March 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5246. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Commercial, Limited Entry Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Program Improvement and Enhancement; Correction [Docket No.: 130528511-4171-03] (RIN: 0648-BD31) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5247. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 14 [Docket No.: 100120035-4085-03] (RIN: 0648-AY26) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5248. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2014 and 2015 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XC895) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5249. A letter from the Acting Deputy, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XD116) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5250. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollack in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD158) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5251. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XD148) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5252. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Longline Component [Docket No.: 12040257-3325-02] (RIN: 0648-XD118) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5253. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XD117) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5254. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD160) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5255. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02 and 1112113751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XD159) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5256. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XD133) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5257. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Change to Start of Pacific Sardine Fishing Year [Docket No.: 130822744-4144-02] (RIN: 0648-BD63) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5258. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Highly Migratory Species; Withdrawal of Emergency Regulations Related to the Deepwater Horizon MC252 Oil Spill [Docket No.: 100510220-4111-06] (RIN: 0648-AY87 and 0648-AY90) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5259. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties [Docket ID: OSM-2013-0003; S1D1S SS08011000 SX066A00067F 134S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX066A00 33F

13XS501520] (RIN: 1029-AC67) received March 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5260. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Adjustments to Civil Penalty Amounts received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5261. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0984; FRL-9904-83-Region 9] received March 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5262. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — VA Dental Insurance Program-Federalism (RIN: 2900-AO85) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5263. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program: Changes Related to the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (RIN: 2900-AO87) received March 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5264. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disclosures to Participate in State Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (RIN: 2900-AO45) received March 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4323. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, and providing for proceedings during the period from April 11, 2014, through April 25, 2014 (Rept. 113-405). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 4411. A bill to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institu-

tions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4412. A bill to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4413. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DENT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KIND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 4414. A bill to clarify the treatment under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of health plans in which expatriates are the primary enrollees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4415. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4416. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the "Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4417. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study to determine the suitability and feasibility of entering into public-private partnerships to operate federally owned golf courses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 4418. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 545. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should adopt and use accrual basis generally accepted accounting principles for Government budgeting, financial reporting, and performance evaluation purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

180. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Resolution No. 340 commending Israel for its cordial and mutually beneficial relationship with the United States and Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1006 urging the Congress to provide full, sustainable funding for the PILT program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

182. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 urging the Congress to propose a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 4411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Article I

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 4413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to regulate commodity prices by insuring fair, open and transparent commodity futures and swap markets and the practices affecting them.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 4416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. TERRY and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 10: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 32: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 78: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BARR, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 270: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 411: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 460: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 498: Mr. FLEMING and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 523: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 524: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 543: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 683: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 713: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 718: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 808: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 886: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1070: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1146: Mr. FORBES and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1199: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1281: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1428: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1508: Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1563: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 1652: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1696: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1698: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1795: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1843: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2415: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2510: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2619: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2648: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2662: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2707: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2727: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2807: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2935: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2939: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3055: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 3240: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3335: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 3339: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3395: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3461: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3470: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 3529: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3530: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3539: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3546: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3580: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3600: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3717: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3723: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3725: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3776: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3852: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3864: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3877: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3921: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3929: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3930: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3933: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3992: Mr. COOK and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3996: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4031: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HURT, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 4045: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4060: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 4103: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4157: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 4158: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 4187: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 4219: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 4225: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4227: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 4241: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4250: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LANCE, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 4261: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 4305: Ms. CHU and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4321: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4323: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4330: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 4336: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 4342: Mr. KLINE and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4344: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4348: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4357: Mr. McHENRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4366: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4370: Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4396: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4399: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4407: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H. J. Res. 20: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. J. Res. 25: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. ENYART.

H. J. Res. 34: Ms. MENG.

H. J. Res. 110: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 148: Ms. SPEIER.

H. Res. 190: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 440: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 480: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 494: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 509: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 519: Mr. TIERNEY.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. HECK of Washington.